DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 730 HE 002 523

TITLE Training for Juvenile Probation Officers. A Workshop Report.

INSTITUTION Children's Bureau (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 62

NOTE 85p.; Children's Bureau Publication Number 398-1962

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Delinquency; *Educational Programs; *Juvenile Courts; *Probation Officers; Professional Education; *Training; Training Objectives; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

This is the report of a workshop that was designed to examine the problems of training for probation officers in juvenile courts. The workshop was planned by the Children's Bureau and held from June 26 through June 30, 1960. Section I of the report discusses the purposes of the workshop, selection of the participants, and the workshop plan. Section II deals with the legal and social components of probation. The role of the probation officer as a social diagnostician, as a controlling person in a delinquent's life, and as an agent of change is discussed in section III. This section also deals with the administrative-management aspects of probation services, as well as the role of the probation officer in furthering research in the area of probation. Section IV identifies the specific knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for effective performance. Section V deals with the implications for training and education, and the last section deals with the image of the probation officer. Two articles on training and training needs of probation officers conclude the report. (AF)

H-SRS
HE

TRAINING for JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED054730



HE 002 523

CHILDREN'S BUREAU PUBLICATION NUMBER 398—1962

ED054730

TRAINING for JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICERS

a workshop report

MERRITT GILMAN
Chief, Training Branch

ALICE M. LOW
Consultant, Training Branch
Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
WELFARE ADMINISTRATION • Children's Bureau • 1962

EDC2430

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C. - Price 30 cents

FOREWORD

For many years the Children's Bureau has been concerned with the necessity for providing adequate training for the people who work with delinquent youth. A series of publications have dealt with this subject, stressing the training useful to police, to institutional personnel, to juvenile court judges, and to probation officers.

Of particular concern has been the fact that there are not enough probation officers in the United States to cover the work assigned to them. Coupled with this is the fact that only a small percentage of the probation officers are adequately prepared educationally to perform their duties. To focus attention on the training needs in this field, the Children's Bureau, through the Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service and in cooperation with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (formerly the National Probation and Parole Association), the Council on Social Work Education, and the Wayne State University School of Social Work, conducted a workshop on the problems of training for probation services in juvenile courts.

This publication is a report of the discussion held at Haven Hill Lodge, Michigan, in June 1960. The report, indicating the differences of opinion among the participants at several points, defines where the field is in its consideration of what probation is. Reconciliation of these divergent views is necessary before there will be agreement on a suitable educational design.

The Children's Bureau is most grateful to all those who took part in developing this publication, and to the agencies and organizations for making it possible for participants to attend the meeting from which this report was developed. Much of the success of the workshop is due to the valuable contributions of the planning committee and the leaders of the work groups, whose names are listed in the appendix.

The Technical Aid and Training Branches of the Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service of the Children's Bureau cooperated in designing and staffing the workshop. The first phase of the project was directed by Bernard Russell, author of one of the working papers used at the meeting.

We are especially indebted to the Ford Foundation which responded to the request for funds to finance the workshop.

Katherine B. Oettinger

KATHERINE B. OETTINGER,
Chief, Children's Bureau.
WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

CONTENTS

TRAINING FOR JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICERS 1

Purposes of the Workshop 3
Selection of Participants 3
The Workshop Plan 4
Nature of the Report 5

LEGAL AND SOCIAL COMPONENTS OF PROBATION 6

The Goals of Probation 7
The Probation Plan 8

THE ROLE OF THE PROBATION OFFICER 10

As a Social Diagnostician 10
As a Controlling Person in the Delinquent's Life 12
As an Agent of Change 13
Administrative-Management Aspects 16
In Research 20

KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND ATTITUDES NECESSARY FOR EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE 22

Knowledge of:

Function of the Juvenile Court 22
Law 22
Human Growth and Change 23
Sociology and Delinquency 24
The Community 24
Self 25
Roles of Other Personnel 25
Authority 26
Records and Their Use 27

A ttitude and Personality Factors 28

Sensitivity to Client Needs 28
Objectivity 28
Nonjudgmental Attitude 28
Personal Integrity 29
Motivation To Learn 29
A Well-Rounded Person 29
Commitment To Serve Delinquents 29

Skills 30
In Making Decisions 30
In Working With Others 31
In Communication 31
In Organization of Work 32
In Using Authority 32
In Observation and Evaluation 33
IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING 34
Graduate Education 34
Undergraduate Education 36
Inservice Training 37
Supervision 38
Orientation 39
Agency Responsibility 39
Other Training Opportunities 41
Promotion 43
THE IMAGE OF THE PROBATION OFFICER 44
COMMENTS 47
SUGGESTED READING 48
APPENDIX 52
Planning Committee 52
Leaders 53
Resource People 53
Staff 54
Participants 54
Training for Probation, by Bernard Russell 57
The Training Needs of Probation Officers, by Elliot Studt 66

TRAINING for JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICERS

THIS IS THE REPORT of a workshop designed to examine the problems of training for probation officers in juvenile courts. Planned by the Children's Bureau, through the Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service, and in cooperation with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (formerly the National Probation and Parole Association), the Council on Social Work Education and Wayne State University School of Social Work, the workshop was held at Haven Hill Lodge, Michigan, from June 26 through June 30, 1960. It was financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

To understand the problems faced by the workshop participants, it is appropriate to trace briefly the history of the development of probation and to point up that there are today varying concepts of what probation is. Historically, probation is probably an outgrowth of the different methods in England and America for suspending sentence. John Augustus is credited with the use of the term. He was a Boston shoemaker who became interested in befriending violators of the law. After bailing them out of jail, he provided them with sympathetic supervision.[1]

Since the first probation law was passed in 1878, the philosophy of how to deal with delinquent youth has changed and has been reflected in various concepts of probation, ranging from probation as punishment to probation as therapy. Still unresolved, these differ-

[1] Diana, Lewis: What is Probation? JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICE SCIENCE, 1960, 51, 189 (July–August).

68

ing concepts have resulted in a great disparity in the probation practices of our modern juvenile courts.

Definitions of probation, as reviewed by Diana, have seen it in many different lights—punitive, merciful, legal, or as social treatment. He believes the professional literature defines probation as "the application of modern, scientific casework to specially selected offenders who are placed by the courts under the personal supervision of a probation officer, sometimes under conditional suspension of punishment, and given treatment aimed at their complete and permanent social rehabilitation." However, he questions if this is an accurate representation of what actually exists.[2]

The field of probation is in a transitional phase. The role of the probation officer and the function of the juvenile court itself have not crystallized sufficiently to offer a clear picture of what is expected of a probation officer. At first thought, defining what a probation officer should do appears simple. But with deeper study, we find the problem is much more complex. What should be done to, for, and with delinquents has often been the topic for discussion by probation staffs, PTA groups, etc. But such talks have not adequately defined the role of the probation officer, nor have they curtailed delinquency. They have pointed up that one of the major problems is that of social control.

But is social control the whole picture? In the use of probation as one of the methods of social control, are we not also seeking to effect a change in the individual delinquent? Is the duty of the probation officer, as an agent of change, not only to assist the individual, but also to seek needed changes in the social structure of the community? Just how much of an agent of change should he be?

How such questions are answered determines how the probation officer should be selected and trained. Such training should take into account today's greater acceptance of the social component in dealing with offenders. It needs also to recognize that the public's stereotype of the probation officer is fading, but has not yet been replaced by the image of the probation officer as a professional person.

The task of defining probation obviously must precede any design for training for probation. In the workshop to be described in this report, it was anticipated that whatever differences of opinion there were about the task of probation would be resolved early in the proceedings. As will be described, it was not always possible to reconcile the different views. As a result, the participants spent much of their time in discussing the task of probation. This meant

---

[2] Diana, Lewis: What is Probation? JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICE SCIENCE, 1960, 51, 197 (July–August).

that the methods of training for probation work received less attention than had been planned.

Purposes of the workshop

The planning committee, made up of staff members of the cosponsoring agencies and leading practitioners and educators in the correctional field, formulated the major tasks for the workshop participants. These were:

1. To examine the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to do the job of probation. Various aspects have been delineated, but it was determined that materials needed to be pulled together for examination as a baseline for training.
2. To examine the most effective ways of getting this body of training to probation officers from the standpoint of both the school and the agency, taking into consideration the present situation; i.e., the large group of probation officers without professional training.

The focus of discussion was to be the training of probation officers in juvenile courts. Both inservice training and professional education were to be considered, but the planning committee set the requirement of at least a B.A. degree as the starting point for training. How training can be used to provide better services in juvenile courts and how it can be initiated were to be of primary concern.

Selection of participants

Nominations for participation in the workshop were made by the cosponsoring agencies, by juvenile court judges, by members of the panel on corrections of the curriculum study, and by selected juvenile court consultants on the State level. The criteria for selection were:

1. For the individual—competence on the job, a demonstrated interest in training, and a willingness to consider training in a fresh way.
2. Geographical representation.
3. Different organizational positions.

The participants selected came from 18 States. There were nine from education—eight from graduate schools of social work and one from an undergraduate program. Fifteen came from the field of

practice, representing a range of positions including chief probation officer, supervisor, State consultant, and training personnel. Only a few of the total group held full-time training positions, since there are a very few people so employed.

The selection committee considered this a representative group, as its members were closely connected to the training of probation officers. This opinion is emphasized since one of the major points of this report is that this group had difficulty achieving agreement on the task of probation.

The workshop plan

In addition to the selected participants, there were six leaders, the project director and five agency representatives who served as staff and resource people. Two papers, "Training for Probation" and "The Training Needs of Probation Officers," were presented to the total group at the opening session.[3] "Training for Probation" covered current information about staffing, academic education, agency training programs, and problems of training. "The Training Needs of Probation Officers" discussed the nature of the probation task, the problems faced by probation officers, and the training tools considered the most effective at different stages of educational need. Following this presentation, three groups were formed, consisting of two leaders, eight participants and two resource people. The leaders were paired so that each of three social workers combined with a leader in the individual disciplines of sociology, psychology, and psychiatry. The pattern of leadership was flexible and was determined within each group, with the understanding that the leaders were free to use their own conceptual framework and were not bound by that of the working papers.

It was anticipated that the papers would serve both as background material and as a springboard for further discussion. If the points covered in the papers could be accepted, then discussion could center on the resolution of the problems in training. However, groups were free to discuss any or all aspects of the total subject and chose in two instances to start from a different point.

Various patterns of communication existed within the groups, with the problems of communication between practice and nonpractice members being evident during the first part of the meeting. Perhaps these problems may be attributed in part to the nonpractice members' lack of knowledge regarding the programs of the agencies,

[3] These papers are included in the Appendix.

41

and the practice people having failed to use educators in training programs and in setting up standards for practice. The problem of communication was met by concentrating on the definition of the probation task. The tempo of discussion accelerated as problems in practice and in training were defined. Educators developed a grasp of the role of the probation officer; practitioners looked to educators for conceptualization as to training needs and methods. However, more time was needed in defining the probation task than was anticipated. As a result, a discussion of methods of training was not pursued in depth. Additional attention needs to be given this area, but the varying opinions expressed in this workshop reveal where the field currently is in its thinking.

Concerns of each group were shared at leaders' meetings to determine the coverage of the total subject. It was not possible for the minutes of meetings to be reviewed by the group, but a report of the workshop was submitted to the participants and the leaders for their comments before this final report was made.

Nature of the report

This report is not intended to be a document that sets standards. Rather, it is a report based on the deliberations of the workshop. While standards are referred to, the definition of the problems in training and their possible solutions are the theme of the report. The basic issues considered here were all raised, but at points some editorial license has been taken in amplifying them. This was necessary because of the limited timespan of the workshop, in which some ideas were given only brief consideration, and were not carried to their full development.

LEGAL AND SOCIAL COMPONENTS OF PROBATION

As pointed out earlier, in the 20th century, probation was frequently defined as a suspension of sentence, with the understanding that further delinquency would result in punishment. Today, probation is more likely to be defined as "a consciously planned treatment process"; "a helping process that changes a law violator into a law abider"; "a new and therapeutic experience with authority"; or "psychotherapy aimed at changing distorted or unrealistic attitudes."

The workshop participants who used these definitions also saw probation as having a different meaning to the delinquent and to the general public. The probationer himself may see the probation officer as a person in authority who checks on him and who has the power to send him away. It is not uncommon for the delinquent to picture the probation officer as hostile or at least unfriendly; the probation officer, however, sees himself as a helping person, one who is treating the delinquent. The general public considers probation as a second chance; if the delinquent can change his behavior, he need not lose his liberty.

The Children's Bureau defines probation as "a legal status in which a child, following adjudication in a delinquency case, is permitted to remain in the community, subject to supervision by the court through the court's probation department or an agency designated by the court, and subject to being returned to the court at any time during the period of probation." [4]

In each of these definitions there is a recognition that the court sees the need for the delinquent to change. Having violated the code of the community, he is given the opportunity to change; if he does not, then other measures are to be taken by the court.

---

[4] STANDARDS FOR SPECIALIZED COURTS DEALING WITH CHILDREN. Children's Bureau Publication 346. Washington 25, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954. 99 pp. (p. 18).

According to this view, the delinquent who does not need to change because his behavior was atypical for him should not be placed on probation. An admonition and warning from the court regarding his own responsibility for his action should be sufficient.

But when the court, through its study of the adolescent and his family, finds that change is necessary, several dispositions are possible. Generally, these are limited to: (1) probation and/or placement in a relative's home or a foster family home, or (2) commitment to a suitable institution or agency for treatment. Whatever the disposition, all the parties concerned should recognize that the court believes that the delinquent needs to change and as a result of its study has selected this way as the most likely path. The disposition is designed both to aid the adolescent and to protect the community, as the court has the joint responsibility of serving both.

The court's disposition, which perceives the need for change and provides the method to be used to accomplish it, is frequently regarded as punishment by the probationer. Having done wrong, the individual must make up for it. On some occasions, the delinquent may regard the disposition of probation as "getting away" with lawbreaking and may react to probation rules with contempt. Such responses have lent credence to the cry of "mollycoddling" by those who have no faith in probation as a method of changing the individual's attitudes and behavior. From another viewpoint, the court's disposition is regarded as an expression of the community's recognition that the delinquent needs to be helped with his social problems. For example, a boy was referred to court for participating in a car theft. He was not the instigator, but had followed the lead of older boys, lest he be considered "chicken." Investigation revealed that this was an isolated incident and that generally he could be relied upon to use good judgment. The judge, knowing this, could effectively point up the responsibility of each boy for his behavior and the fallacy of trying to prove one's manhood through delinquent behavior.

The goals of probation

Because of the differing needs of individual delinquents, the goals of probation vary from immediate to long range, from limited to broad, from mere stopping of the delinquent behavior to rehabilitation of the individual. The minimum goal of stopping delinquent behavior is generally accepted. Should goals be higher? Should the goal be to help the delinquent achieve his highest potential? Should probation continue until the delinquent has made an adequate social adjustment in the community, perhaps through careful planning regarding his life situation? Phrasing this another way, should

probation terminate when the youth is considered law abiding, or should it continue in order to resolve other social or emotional problems?

If the answer is that the probation officer should assist only with those problems that are related to delinquent behavior, the question arises how this could be determined. Can we delineate which areas of the client's life are the concern of the probation officer and which are not? Would the probation officer work with a delinquent youth regarding his dating problems, for example? Or, would this be overreaching?

The workshop participants saw these factors as affecting the goals of probation:

1. The situation and capacity of the client.
2. The culture and environment of the youth and his family.
3. The concept of probation held by the judge and the probation staff.
4. The quality and quantity of staff, as they affect the service available to the youth and his family.
5. The court's situation in the community and the availability of community resources.

The probation plan

To meet the goals of probation, the probation plan needs to be tailored to the individual and to have within it the elements of change required by the court. Stereotyped rules and conditions should be eliminated. The philosophy of the juvenile court movement is based upon the needs of the individual child. Falling back on standard probation conditions for all delinquents denies the uniqueness of approach necessary for successful treatment. How the probation plan is arrived at will be discussed in the next section.

The probation officer is responsible for formulating the plan; the judge may approve it, modify it, or disapprove it. It is the probation officer who has the responsibility for carrying out the details of the plan, along with the delinquent.

Some courts set down general rules of probation but it seems better to leave the details of limitations of activities to the supervisory authority vested in the probation officer. For example, matters such as keeping probation appointments, attending school and the limiting of travel should be left to the authority of the probation officer.[5]

---

[5] STANDARDS FOR SPECIALIZED COURTS DEALING WITH CHILDREN, op. cit., pp. 18, 19.

While a general treatment plan may be agreed upon at the time of the hearing, it would be unwise to make this a part of the court order, since the plan may need to be modified as treatment progresses. The probation officer should be permitted to take such action within the scope of his authority.

As referred to earlier, the probation plan is subject to different interpretations by the delinquent and the court personnel. It can be considered as the punishment meted out for wrongdoing by the former, or as the framework within which social treatment can be accomplished as envisioned by the latter. It can also be interpreted as neither punishment nor rehabilitation, but a social plan focused on the welfare of the adolescent and the community. This plan requires that the youth control his behavior in specific ways and is designed to help him effect an adequate adjustment with the help of the probation officer.

46

THE ROLE OF THE PROBATION OFFICER

As a social diagnostician

From the time the adolescent and his parents come to the attention of the court, the probation officer is assessing them as individuals and as members of a family and community. The social study made by the probation officer is designed to: (1) identify and evaluate the factors causing the delinquent behavior, and (2) develop and recommend a necessary program which will eliminate or alleviate these factors.

During the interval that the probation officer is making the social study for the court's use, he is also preparing the delinquent and his parents for the hearing. He tries to learn the meaning of this total experience to the youth and at the same time convey to him the purpose of the court and the functions of the staff members who will deal with him. In some cases, the social study will reveal that the delinquent does not need the services of the court—that there are other community agencies available to meet his needs.[6] In these situations, the role of the probation officer is to enable the delinquent to accept the referral—and to give the agency, to which he is referred, adequate information regarding him so that the referral will be accomplished.

In still other cases, the study will point out that the delinquent does not need social services. His behavior was atypical; social control can be assured without relying on probation or other measures. In these situations, the judge can use the social study prepared by the probation officer as a way of making the hearing a positive experience for the child. Here again, the point is that the court's purpose is to serve the child; it can do this best if the remarks made by the judge to the child are based on an understanding of that child.

[6] STANDARDS FOR SPECIALIZED COURTS DEALING WITH CHILDREN, op. cit., p. 97.

The material obtained for the social study comes from many sources, among them: the delinquent himself, his parents or relatives, the school, the police, social agencies, professional personnel such as doctors or ministers, and other interested and informed people concerned with the delinquent. Selection of what material goes into the report in order to give a clear picture of this youth is at the core of the probation officer's job. Information from these sources needs to be blended and evaluated. When reports have been received from other professional people, these should be incorporated into the study in order to formulate the probation plan. This method offers the judge a unified, comprehensive report rather than a set of reports which may need consolidating.

As the person responsible for the social study, the probation officer needs to be able to work with ease and competence with the people providing information. He needs to know when to refer for psychological testing or for psychiatric study, and how to use the information obtained from these sources. His evaluation of the material in the social study is the basis of the probation plan which defines the means of helping the delinquent to achieve responsible behavior.

The diversity of the activities assigned to the probation officer, highlighted under the topic "The Probation Task," in the working paper, "The Training Needs of Probation Officers," was discussed as a problem in practice by one of the workshop groups. The example given was that staffs are frequently composed of a combination of older men oriented toward surveillance and control, and of newer probation officers whose focus is on therapy and other casework services.

While it was agreed that the probation officer should not be exclusively a psychotherapist, the degree to which he is involved in doing therapy was not decided by the group. The nearest resolution of the discussion was that the probation officer is a social worker whose function is to provide treatment consistent with the philosophy of social work as practiced today. This same group decided that the probation officer who primarily regards his role as that of a therapist may well be the one who leaves the field of probation, as it did not appear to offer him the opportunity he seeks as a professional person. This particular work group concluded that the probation officer should not engage in psychotherapy, but should only ask questions, make statements, and require conduct on the part of the delinquent as is defined in the legal description of the probation officer's duties. However, the probation officer in his use of social casework should be able to build on the strength of his relationship with the delinquent in order to work out a sound probation plan. There were other workshop participants who used a broader description of the probation

officer's function, pointing out that he should use all his skills and knowledge in the appropriate social work method (casework, group work, community organization) to assist the delinquent.

As a controlling person in the delinquent's life

When the need for the delinquent to change has been recognized and approval has been given to the probation plan, both the delinquent and the probation officer are responsible for implementing the plan.

The limitations set by the court for the delinquent youth are restraints that are appropriate and often essential facets of the plan to assist the youth and protect the community. The probation officer is present to help the delinquent to understand and to comply with the probation plan; he is also available to help the client work on his problems, as they relate to delinquent behavior. The goal of both is to restore the delinquent from his restricted supervised status to legal freedom. Until it is safe to do this, the probation officer is expected to provide the special controls and relationship resources necessary.

The question arises as to whether the probation officer can be both a controlling and a helping person. Some people believe that control exerted over the probationer is antitherapeutic because it is resented by the probationer. Others would hold that there is necessarily authority in the helping relationship. It can be a positive force; when the probation officer abrogates his authority, he misses giving the delinquent the opportunity to deal with the problems he has regarding authority within his own personal and social relationships.

But how far does the control or the helping function go? Does the probation officer have the right to tell a probationer to shave off his mustache or cut his hair? Can he require him to wear nonpointed shoes?

The answers to these questions lie in the goal that is set when the probation plan is made. In general, this goal will be to help the client develop socially acceptable standards and adequate personal and social controls. In the process of developing these, they cannot be at any point too alien to him. The probation officer and the delinquent need to find a comfortable way of working together—one within the cultural system of the delinquent.[7] If the attempt is made by the probation officer to get the client to adopt a different set of cultural values, then the probation plan becomes a form of coercion against which the delinquent will rebel. The plan should be designed to assist not to trap the probationer.

---

[7] See working paper in Appendix: "The Training Needs of Probation Officers", p. 66.

The more common problems of probation are those involving social relationships. Should the probation officer control the delinquent's selection of friends; or his association with other probationers? Should certain hangouts be prohibited? Are there times when the probation officer takes over the authority of the parent? Here again, the answers lie in an understanding of what is the individual goal of probation. The effort is to assist the delinquent in establishing a more satisfactory and an acceptable pattern of behavior. How far can he himself go alone in his social relationships? Does he need control for a period of time, or is guidance enough so that he develops the control needed?

There are certain legal boundaries to which the delinquent is held by the probation officer. One of these is school attendance. If the delinquent is of school age and in good health, he must attend school. The efforts of the probation officer are then twofold: to help the youth accept school and gain interest in it; and to assist the school in understanding and in planning to meet the needs of this youth. In some cases the court may help the community evaluate school attendance requirements as they affect the youth of the community.

The control plan for the delinquent is set up to help him achieve good citizenship. He must live within the law. The probation officer identifies with the mores of the community and with the law. He represents the law-abiding community. If the probationer violates the law, the probation officer deals with it. For example, if the probationer admits that he has been shoplifting, the probation officer handles this in an appropriate manner—by rereferral to the court for another disposition, by forcing the delinquent to return the merchandise, or by purchase of the articles taken. The manner in which this is done can be therapeutic or can convince the youth that (1) he can outsmart the adults when he is caught, or (2) no one will ever understand him. In no case can the probation officer ignore the delinquency; the delinquent needs to know that there are adults that he can't seduce into delinquency as silent partners.

In some courts, a new petition is filed for each delinquent act. In others, the probation officer is consulted before a new petition is filed. It is generally believed that when a new petition is being considered, the probation officer should be consulted. Often, based on his understanding of the delinquent, the probation officer can contribute important knowledge in making this decision.

As an agent of change

Concern with change, the most characteristic common element of the methods of social work, is also at the core of the probation

officer's job. Change must be planned and the plan must be followed thoughtfully. Both the delinquent and the probation officer need to understand and agree on the goals toward which they are striving. The process of positive change may come about through—

1. Interaction between the delinquent and the probation officer, through the help given directly to the delinquent and/or members of his family.[8]
2. Referral of the delinquent to other resources and the help he receives through these services. The knowledge of other resources and the ability to help the delinquent use them makes the probation officer more effective.
3. Creation of new resources to enable the individual to solve his problem.

The probation officer also serves as a change agent in relation both to the court and the total community. Where he observes that policies or procedures of the court need revision, it is his obligation to work for constructive change. Within the community, he should point up what additional services are needed for youth. Generally, he should work through the channels provided by the court rather than independently.

This idea of the probation officer as a change agent raises many questions. Among them are these:

> If the family is the basic problem, does the probation officer work with them, or refer them to a social agency? Is probation child-centered, to the exclusion of the parents?
>
> If the delinquency involved group participation, should the probation officer take the responsibility for intervention with the group when not all members of the group are under court jurisdiction?
>
> To what extent should the probation officer function as a community change agent? Should he organize and lead a youth group?

In dealing with this first question, the Children's Bureau, in its publication, *Standards for Specialized Courts Dealing With Children*, stated on page 70, "In certain situations, much of the work of a proba-

---

[8] Boehm, Werner W.: Objectives of the Social Work Curriculum of the Future. SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM STUDY, Vol. I. New York: Council on Social Education, 1959. 291 pp. (p. 131).

tion officer may have to be done with the parents. Although the parents of a child on probation are not themselves on probation or under supervision, they should be aware of the fact that their behavior and ability to help and to control the child may have a bearing on the success of this service. If, for example, the parents are interfering with the probation officer or are failing to abide by a restraining order of the court, the probation officer may have to bring the case back into court."

The second question triggered a discussion by the workshop participants on the responsibility for probation of individuals not officially under court jurisdiction. Nationally, there remains a sharp difference as to the use of official versus unofficial probation.[9] It was agreed by the workshop participants that regardless of the kind of intervention the probation officer attempted, he must have the knowledge to identify the kind of problems and the appropriate way to deal with the problems; for example, intervention with the family, with the peer group, with the community.

The question of the probation officer as a community organizer drew the attention of each workshop group. Some participants saw the probation officer's role limited to the casework function of overcoming the distortions in the attitudes of clients. Others viewed his role as that of a social worker who deals with many aspects of the community, as a way of meeting the treatment needs of the delinquent. This latter group believed that the probation officer must ally himself with groups seeking the solution to those community problems which are causative factors in the delinquent's behavior resulting in the referral to court. One person reasoned that if we understand, as the result of a careful study, the various factors which led to the poor adjustment of the delinquent within the community, the probation officer then has a responsibility of dealing with those pressures as they impinge on the behavior of the youngster and as they impinge on the activities of other youngsters, who at this point may or may not have come to the attention of the court.

Does this indicate that the probation officer should take responsibility for any or all problems that the delinquent might have? The consensus of the group was that it is within the function of the probation officer to provide community leadership which would be aimed at encouraging and helping the community to develop resources to deal

---

[9] STANDARD FAMILY COURT ACT. New York: National Probation and Parole Association, 1959. 64 pp. (p. 28–29).
STANDARD JUVENILE COURT ACT. (Sixth edition.) New York: National Probation and Parole Association, 1959. 71 pp. (p. 31–32).
STANDARDS FOR SPECIALIZED COURTS DEALING WITH CHILDREN, op. cit., p. 43, 44.

with such problems. For example, the probation officer might attend meetings of community organizations and encourage their interest in various problems faced by youth in the community—such as the need for organized social activities for teenagers, or the problem of employment during summer vacations.

It has been pointed out that "the court is in a particularly good position to see the gaps in services which exist in the community, to bring these gaps to the attention of planning groups in the community, and to work with them to secure more adequate services." [10]

The size of the probation staff, the resources of the community, and the policies of a given court determine how much of a community organizer the probation officer will be. Juvenile courts, along with other community agencies, have a responsibility for bringing about wholesome changes in the community. The individual probation officer should be assigned his part of that responsibility in a way that will not dissipate his effectiveness in meeting the demands of his caseload.

The question of how circumscribed or how broad is the community organization role of the probation officer was not resolved at the workshop. More thought needs to be given to this aspect of the probation task, as there is wide divergence of opinion in the field.

Administrative-management aspects

An indispensable precondition to effective probation services is an effective working relationship between the judge and the probation officer. Each must have a clear understanding of his role in the process. This means that channels of communication should be open between the judge and the probation officer in order to provide for a free exchange of ideas.

One workshop group pointed out that frequently probation officers do not respect the right of the judge to be the final decision maker regarding the plan set up by the court for the delinquent. This refers to those instances where a judge disagrees with the recommendations of a probation officer in making his decision. In such situations, both the judge and the probation officer need to look for ways to collaborate effectively. In some instances, the judge may need help in accepting knowledgeable recommendations based on a thorough study of the delinquent; in others, the probation officer may need to understand that the judge has taken other factors into consideration in making his decision. It should be remembered that the judge in deciding a case must take into consideration the protection of the community.

---

[10] STANDARDS FOR SPECIALIZED COURTS DEALING WITH CHILDREN, op. cit., p. 97, 98.

Also some judges, in certain types of cases, may be motivated by community reaction. As the judge and the probation officer work together, the judge tends to become more "case-conscious" and the probation officer to become more "community-conscious." Thus the occasions of differences between the recommendation of the probation officer and the plan accepted by the judge diminish and boil down to those cases where legal principle dictates something other than the recommendation made to the judge by the probation officer.

This led into the question of whether or not probation officers should let families know of their recommendations before these were presented to the judge. It was agreed that the family should know that the recommendation was being made and also that the judge might follow, modify, or reject it.

The group recognized that both the judge and the probation officer have knowledge to bring to bear on the plan set up by the court. The judge is held accountable for the plan by the community, but this does not make the probation officer any less responsible than the judge for the kind of plan that is developed.

While the statutes spell out the jurisdiction of the court, they are often general in nature and do not detail the function, procedures, or duties of the various personnel attached to the court. This, therefore, is left to administrative decision.

The probation officer, because of the pressures of a large caseload, needs to determine how he can best use his time. How can he cut corners? How can he select the most important job to be done? Are there different levels of treatment so that there can be a redivision of labor?

From the history of other professions, the indication is that more than one level of professional competence usually develops at a point when measures to deal with the personnel shortage coincide with the achievement of clarity about basic professional functions.[11] If there are functions that can be performed by agency-trained personnel, then the professionally trained (graduate) probation officers can be utilized for those tasks requiring knowledge and skill.

Research on this redivision of labor or on the differential use of personnel is in progress. This was necessitated by the fact that it was impossible to produce the number of graduate social workers needed, and the fact that some of the largest and most crucial social welfare services are being staffed primarily by persons without pro-

[11] Boehm, op. cit., p. 63.

fessional education in any field.[12] Other professions, such as medicine, teaching, nursing, and dentistry, have analyzed their functions, and by combining them in new ways, have developed auxiliary personnel to achieve a more efficient work pattern.

There are many studies completed and in progress on manpower utilization. In addition to the California study just noted, there are the following among others:

1. The Educational Standards Project of the Bureau of Public Assistance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In progress.

2. Inservice Training and Reduced Workloads—Experiments in a State Department of Public Welfare by Edwin J. Thomas and Donna L. McLeod, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1960. 129 pp. This is a completed study of the effectiveness of inservice training for improving staff performance. It delineates the areas in which inservice training is ineffective.

3. A Study of Non-Professional Personnel in Social Work—The Army Social Work Specialist—the doctoral dissertation of Fergus T. Monahan, the Catholic University Press, 1960. 201 pp.

4. The National Association of Social Workers is studying the role of the professional social worker.

One workshop group attempted to list the tasks of a probation officer that could be assigned to a person with a bachelor's degree. Although there was not unanimity of opinion, the following tasks were listed:

1. Financial bookkeeping and collections (especially with support cases).

2. Sundry details regarding court appearance of a probationer which require time.

3. Actual physical transportation of clients to and from agencies, etc.

4. The work involved in dealing with juvenile traffic offenders.

5. A number of so-called "surveillance" or "direct supervision" measures which involved direct pronouncement to clients and certain kinds of checking such as on grades and attendance.

---

[12] Advisory Committee on Social Welfare Education: SOCIAL WORKERS FOR CALIFORNIA. Los Angeles: Regents of the University of California, 1960. 37 pp. (p. 34).

6. Some of the liaison work with community agencies and institutions regarding clients.

7. Gathering of some kinds of behavioral data included in the social study.

8. Much of the paperwork now done by the probation officer, such as writing letters for appointments.

9. Some referrals to other resources and a number of the details regarding arrangements for community services.

It was also pointed out that not all probationers need treatment requiring professional knowledge and skills, so that these cases could be assigned to a probation officer under the direction of a professionally trained supervisor. Thus a part of the probation caseload could be carried by the untrained officer.

The objections raised by various workshop participants to this preliminary discussion of such a redivision of labor were numerous. They saw some of these listed functions as secretarial—such as writing letters for appointments. This frequently is handled by secretaries rather than by the officers. Other functions could be handled by volunteers, such as transportation of clients. Still other functions should be handled by a bookkeeper, as in point 1. Included in the list were functions considered by many to be an integral part of the professional duties of the probation officer—such as the liaison work with community agencies and institutions regarding clients. In addition, some participants feared that probation officers with graduate training would, when relieved of such functions, tend to operate principally as psychotherapists.

Returning to the earlier question—how can the probation officer do an adequate job under the pressure of numerous cases—one expedient suggested was the use of a treatment unit for the more complex cases. This was countered with the suggestion that such complex cases, requiring both ample time and professional skill, probably should be referred to other community resources. It was also pointed out that the use of a special treatment unit in the court might tend to focus skilled help on a few and result in the casual handling of the many.

In all caseloads, there are delinquents with varying needs. The probation officer needs to recognize these and to plan his time accordingly. The number of treatment hours available are limited; how they are used is a problem in management. Regarding the administrative aspects of his work, the probation officer must understand the framework within which he works and recognize how procedures affect practice goals. Administration is a process in itself which requires thought-

ful scrutiny to make it most effective. One of the key personnel in administration in contributing to raising the quality of service is the supervisor.

How the job can be defined and divided is a research task. Until it is completed, the knowledge and experience currently available must be our guide.

In research

Working on a case-to-case basis, the probation officer might tend to focus on the psychodynamics of individual delinquents in his caseload to the exclusion of developing an understanding of the social environment in which these delinquents live. To guard against this and to gain knowledge of the many causes of delinquency, the probation officer needs to aid in the preparation for research. Through adequate recording of data and social information and through posing questions for study, the probation officer can make his contribution to research.

The court too has a research obligation. A tremendous volume of material, the study of which may well provide answers to questions frequently asked, is available. The probation officer and the court are trustees of a potential fund of knowledge which is vitally important and which should be available to research workers. Courts are obligated to assist in providing the means for facilitating research which means time, money, and the working cooperation of the court. Every effort should be made to create an atmosphere within which the research worker and the probation staff all feel comfortable with the fact that research is going on. A structure for discharging this research obligation is necessary. Court personnel should welcome research without imposing restrictions on the research worker either in the area of inquiry or in the use that is made of the knowledge obtained through research.

Similarly, there is an obligation on the part of the research worker to inform agency staff who are involved peripherally or otherwise in the research task. They should know what the process entails, what the goals are, and the results of the research.

Some of the barriers to effective research are lack of staff time to work with research personnel, a fear of uncovering deficiencies and insufficient conviction of the values of research to accord it a high priority in the overall duties of the court. Or, perhaps the staff's unfamilarity with research leads to a kind of defensive reaction to the research worker who comes to the court. However, attention to research offers both the agency and the probation officer rich rewards.

827

Accepting and using research findings opens up new scientific approaches to the multiple problems of delinquency. The probation officer necessarily approaches the problems of the individual delinquent, but he also needs the perspective of the individual as a part of the social system. He needs to understand that individuals are a part of the social whole—a part of a community, and that, in this sense, no one is isolated.

Statistics, based on the monthly reports of each officer, are compiled by the court and are sometimes used in research and in the interpretation of the court's activities. They should not, however, be considered as research in themselves. Statistical reports and administrative studies can be used to plan and administer the court's program. Trends in data can provide the basis for estimating future needs of personnel and services; workload data are helpful in indicating staff requirements, or in redirecting or refocusing staff assignments or activities.

A centralized statistical system should be established under the direction of a person competent to use statistics for research, planning, administration, and public information. Under his supervision, a reliable system of reporting and collecting the necessary information should be established.

Such a system is not possible in small courts. However, even these courts need certain basic statistical data for their own use and for the use of agencies having responsibility for providing services for children. Where there is a State probation system, or a State agency offering juvenile court consultant service, the small court can receive assistance in setting up and maintaining adequate records.

KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND ATTITUDES NECESSARY FOR EFFECTIVE PERFORMANCE

It had been suggested to the workshop participants that they familiarize themselves with "Education for Social Workers in the Correctional Field," by Elliot Studt.[13] This volume of the *Social Work Curriculum Study* discussed the content and behaviors desirable for practice in corrections in chapter II. The knowledge, skills, and attitudes enumerated below are those considered by the participants. No effort was made to list them in the order of their importance.

Knowledge of:

Function of the juvenile court

The function of the juvenile court is to determine when society has the right to enter into a child's life, and when such is the case, to deal with him on an individualized basis.

Law

Knowledge of the law is a prerequisite for the adequate functioning of the probation officer. He needs to have an understanding of the philosophy and role of law in society. The principles, strengths, and weaknesses of the law and the legal system need to be understood in order to apply social work knowledge in the court. With respect for law should come an improvement in the relationships between lawyers and probation officers.

Difficulty often comes when there appears to be a conflict between treatment needs and the legal rights of the individual.

[13] Studt, Elliot: Education for Social Workers in the Correctional Field. SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM STUDY, Vol. V. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1959. 350 pp.

In such situations, the probation officer needs to be aware of the legal basis of the court and from whence the authority over the delinquent stems. The laws protecting the rights of the parent and the child must be understood and respected.

A feeling for law might be developed as it is in law student neophytes, where stress is placed on the functions of the law, why there are laws, and what laws protect. The object of this would be that the probation officer would not see, as so often happens, legal intervention as confusing and interfering. A better understanding of law would encourage collaboration between probation officers and lawyers, who too often become adversaries in court.

In the parlance of the social worker, the court is a legal setting. The probation officer must see himself in relation to law. While much of the knowledge of law must come through inservice training, the basic respect for law should be taught by the universities to all social work students.

Anglo-Saxon law is based on the adversary concept. Unless the probation officer is prepared for this method of getting at the truth, he may well find himself in needless conflict. The traditions and practice of law are very different from those of social work which has derived its practice from the behavioral sciences. Over the centuries a highly sophisticated legal system has developed, while knowledge and practice in the social treatment systems are at a very different level of development. This brings an uneven mixture and widely differing views about the function of the court as a social institution, and of the court's goals in regard to delinquent behavior.

Human growth and change

Knowledge of the dynamics of human behavior and of personality development enables the probation officer to understand the reasons behind a youth's actions. Knowledge of psychopathology aids in the recognition of disturbed youths and parents.

There are many delinquents in the probation officer's caseload who lack the social and personal resources needed to adjust without help. Many become delinquent because of situational factors and then react defiantly to the process of arrest and of the juvenile court. The behavior of some others is due to neurotic conflicts or a psychosis. A still greater number suffer from behavior disorders characterized by poor impulse control, sometimes termed "acting-out" behavior. Understanding the behavior and attitudes of this variety of

persons requires both sociological and psychological knowledge. In some cases, it is important to have sufficient recognition of pathology so that the probation officer does not attempt to deal with the emotionally ill person, but rather can refer this individual to other professional resources.

The competence of the probation officer is judged by his ability to understand the causes of the delinquent behavior of the adolescent, by his ability to determine how this behavior can be modified or controlled, and by his ability to render whatever assistance is appropriate. Knowledge of growth and development precedes these abilities.

Sociology and delinquency

Knowledge of social phenomena, of class values, cultural patterns, and economic influences is needed as background to understand the behavior patterns of youth. Knowledge of earlier efforts to deal with delinquency, of the role of the police; of the background, philosophy, and structure of the juvenile court; of the uses made of detention and of training schools; of the efforts to prevent delinquency; of the treatment agencies such as child guidance clinics; and of the extent of the current problem—all this is needed by the probation officer.

In recent years there has been increased awareness and appreciation of the rich contribution made by social scientists in the study of delinquency, its causes and treatment. In addition to the studies of crime and delinquency, sociology offers abundant knowledge of social stratification, of family disorganization and of the impact of social systems and institutions on individuals.

The community

Knowledge of the power structure of the community, of its social resources, how it reacts to various types of delinquent behavior, and what methods of social action can be gained to secure new resources for youth—these are needed by the probation officer seeking to serve delinquents. Knowledge of the power structure and of the economic and bureaucratic organization of modern community life offers an understanding of how these determine what can be accomplished. Although there was not agreement on the role of the probation officer as to his activities as a community organizer, the knowledge of the community and how its values are crystallized in agency structure and procedures were seen as important.

031

Self

In probation work, the officer himself helps the adolescent modify his behavior. It is the relationship with the delinquent that is the major treatment tool. The better the probation officer understands his own attitudes and beliefs, the better he can manage to discipline himself and to use the developing relationship in a professional way. Knowledge of self mitigates against the probation officer working out his personal conflicts through his clients.

Self-awareness was considered a basic need for the probation task by the workshop participants, who saw it as an ongoing process that should continue throughout the course of the probation officer's work. Two ways were seen as helpful in structuring the job experience so as to increase the probation officer's self-awareness: casework supervision and peer group learning experiences.

It was also recognized that the probation officer needs to identify with community standards. Unless he does, he cannot represent them successfully to the delinquent. A corollary to this thought was that when the probation officer overidentifies with the delinquent, the delinquent understands this to mean that his behavior is condoned. It is possible that such overidentification is due to the fact that the probation officer himself has not worked through his own conflicts with authority.

Roles of other personnel

To avoid a conflict of approach to the delinquent and his family, the roles of other persons serving him need to be clearly defined and understood. Knowledge of the proper role of the police and of juvenile bureaus and information regarding detention facilities and the appropriate use of detention and the contributions to be expected of detention personnel are all needed by the probation officer. In order to integrate the functions of the court with the functions of the other agencies in the community, knowledge of the various roles of these agencies is essential.

Knowledge of the role of lawyers and of the judge and of other professional people has previously been discussed. Perhaps an emphasis on the role of the administrator of the court is also appropriate. Knowledge of the administrator's function is useful in determining what problems should be brought to him for consideration and solution. This clarifies problems that remain to be solved by the probation officer.

632

Authority

Knowledge of authority—its use and misuse—was emphasized by the participants as one of the keys to effective probation. Although the professional literature offers many definitions of authority, referring to both its sociological and psychological aspects, perhaps the dictionary version offers an adequate frame of reference. "Authority" is (1) the right to command and to enforce obedience; the right to act by virtue of office; (2) the power derived from intellectual or moral superiority, from reputation, or from whatever else commands influence, respect, or esteem; as the authority of wisdom.

Persons coming before the court generally know of its power to restrain the delinquent or remove him from his home and commit him to an institution or other appropriate facility. Knowledge of the proper application of social controls determines whether the deliquent can benefit from the court experience or not. When to direct or when to guide takes knowledge growing out of the understanding of authority and the varied reaction individuals have to it. As Eileen Younghusband phrased it: "One of the dilemmas of the modern juvenile court is that in proportion as it concentrates on understanding and treatment of persons rather than on punishment for offenses, it widens the gap, raises the barriers of communication, between it and those who appear before it. Probably this is what lies at the root of at least some of the criticism about the softness and sentimentality of juvenile courts." [14]

Each group spent time in considering the various aspects of this major topic. As an example, one group considered briefly the problem of setting limits on the behavior of the delinquent. Some probation officers believed there was conflict in the role of the officer as a permissive helping person, on the one hand, and the controlling officer of the court, on the other. This problem was frequently less difficult for the untrained officer who tended to aline himself more with the authority of the court and the police. The untrained officer was better able to act in an uncritical, conflict-free manner, often, however, artificially setting himself up as an image of the "good law-abiding citizen." While the group recognized the necessity for the trained probation officer also to project himself as a model of decorum and a representative of the law, they also saw the need

[14] Eileen L. Younghusband: The Dilemma of the Juvenile Court. SOCIAL SERVICE REVIEW, 1959, 33, 10–20 (March).

SB 33

for discretion and leeway in fulfilling this role. One cannot expect the client who has difficulty with following rules to be able to adhere completely to the requirements of probation, as they are sometimes rigidly defined. He would be more apt to be committed, thus taking himself out of the ranks of the probationer.

Authority of the probation officer is provided by law, but in addition he has another kind of authority which rests on the body of professional knowledge and skills that constitute the field of probation work. One group formulated the role of the probation officer and the authority implicit in his job in terms of the decisions which he must make that affect the client—from the initial point of the client being engaged in the processes of law to the point of his being released from the process. These are discussed under "Skills."

Records and their use

How and why records are kept is essential knowledge. The probation officer should be both student and critic of his own practice, and recording what he does gives him this opportunity. Each court will determine the social record that suits its needs.

Often probation officers are impatient with the amount of time spent in recording, but few would eliminate it. The case record serves as a protection to the client, as a possible research tool, and as a way to develop skill and to gain new knowledge. The chief function of the record itself is to describe the situation, what the delinquent is doing about it, and the suggested plan for assisting him.

Workshop participants discussed the use the various courts make of the record, and raised the question as to whether the attorney for the youth should be allowed to see the social record. Reference was made to the standard in respect to confidentiality:

> Some judges prefer that the probation officer's summary and recommendations be made in written form while others prefer an oral report. When the judge has not read the reports, an oral presentation may be preferable in that it saves time. Regardless of the method followed, the facts presented—either orally or written—upon which the court relies, should be open to rebuttal by the child, his family, or their counsel, and witnesses may be introduced to rebut them. This does not mean that the social record (which may contain other facts, confidential in nature and not relevant to disposition), should be avail-

> able to the child, parent, guardian, or counsel. However, only that information in the record upon which the court relies in making disposition should be made known to the child, parent, guardian, or counsel.[15]

Some of the participants believed that this standard is controversial, that there still is room for discussion of the advisability of keeping some material confidential but giving the judge the benefit of it in determining disposition. In this situation, as in a few others, it was apparent that while time-tested, legal standards have been set, they have not had complete acceptance in the behavioral sciences.

Attitudes and personality factors

Sensitivity to client needs

Each adolescent is different. Recognition of this should be combined with an imaginative approach to the individual's problem. There may be as many different solutions to delinquent behavior as there are causes. Groups of adolescents, too, express themselves in many different ways. Appreciation of this enables the probation officer to relate positively to a variety of people.

Objectivity

An unprejudiced viewpoint, a perspective of events, a professional rather than personal approach—all of these go into a careful consideration of how to understand and assist the adolescent before the court. Acceptance of the varying backgrounds of people and of their different sets of values and a willingness to learn both from the delinquent and his family and from other personnel serving them is a basic attitude needed by the person who wishes to help others. Also needed is an acceptance of the need for administrative procedures and a willingness to work within them—or, if they need changing, to work on this thoughtfully, seeing the needs not of just one youngster, but of the many.

Nonjudgmental attitude

It is more important to see the delinquent as an adolescent in trouble than it is to condemn his behavior. He can be reached

---

[15] STANDARDS FOR SPECIALIZED COURTS DEALING WITH CHILDREN, op. cit., p. 56, 57.

35

by an understanding person where he would be repelled by a condemning one. As has often been said: Accept the child, but not his misbehavior.

The probation officer needs to accept the feelings of the delinquent and of the community regarding his behavior and to interpret to each the reasons for such feelings. A non-judgmental attitude thus serves both the youth and community in the process of rehabilitation.

Personal integrity

Often the most hardened delinquent will eventually respond to honesty and fairplay. Sometimes the probation officer serves as a model so that an adolescent through his respect and regard for the probation officer will take on his values. When integrity is lacking in the probation officer, the delinquent utilizes his discovery of this fact to rationalize his own anti-social behavior.

Motivation to learn

Probation officers should have the capacity and willingness to learn. Both knowledge and skill can be gained through job experience. This can be enriched by competent supervision, professional literature, institutes, training courses, and advanced formal education. Included in this should be the probation officer's acceptance of research and his interest in participating in it.

A well-rounded person

Probation officers are frequently required to operate in very diverse social situations. Their effectiveness will be determined by their ability to relate easily and comfortably to persons who vary in their cultural backgrounds. In addition, because of the many pressures of his job, the probation officer needs a variety of other personal interests so that it is not a case of all work and no play.

Commitment to serve delinquents

Some participants in the workshop believed that probation officers need to be truly dedicated and pioneering spirits. The unresolved problems in the field were seen as serious obstacles unless one was so dedicated. This viewpoint, as stated at the workshop, seemed to be an overemphasis to some members of the group. Certainly a deep interest in adolescents and a continued concern for their welfare would be an attitude sought in

the juvenile probation officer for successful performance. Willingness to "inch along," to fit the tempo of the treatment to the ability of the delinquent, whether this be rapid or slow, is an attitude that is necessary with youth.

Skills

In making decisions

Participants at the workshop emphasized that skills in decision making were of critical importance to the probation officer. Because of the nature of his position, it is at times necessary that the probation officer make emergency judgments which may affect the freedom of a youth, the safety of the community, and the rights of parents to determine what is best for their children. Many times decisions such as those regarding detention must be made on the spot and under pressure. The "rightness" or "wrongness" of the probation officer's decisions will be continually weighed by his immediate superiors, the juvenile court judge, the police, the client's family, and the community. Every decision will be a calculated risk, with the risk lessened only by the increasing degree of skill the probation officer develops through experience. Because of the human and social variables inherent in each individual case, the risk factor can never be eliminated.

At times the probation officer may feel that he's the centerpoint of a tug-of-war rope. Temptation will be pulling at one end of the rope to identify too strongly with the arrested youngster and the subsequent inclination to go the "extra mile" in his behalf. At the other end of the rope another temptation will be pulling for the "security of the community" at all costs and an unwillingness to buck community attitudes.

His protection against being pulled toward either extreme will be his skills in decision making and his ability to defend his decisions on the basis of logical treatment goals balanced against the safety of the community and the welfare of the probationer.

Four areas of decision making were identified by the workshop participants:

1. Decisions concerning apprehension and detention. This emphasizes the control function of the probation officer.
2. Decisions concerning recommended disposition. Here the role of the probation officer as a diagnostician is emphasized.
3. Decisions regarding the supervision and treatment of the

probationer. The probation officer's role is that of the agent of change.

4. Decisions regarding release from probation. The probation officer's role is one of evaluation of the effectiveness of the treatment plan for the youth.

The probation officer also seeks to help the client make his own decisions. Independent functioning is the major goal. Good citizenship needs to be achieved because of the decisions that the probationer makes of his own volition, so that external controls need no longer be relied upon.

In working with others

Often many people are involved in working with the delinquent youngsters—family members, relatives, ministers, teachers, police, detention personnel, complainants. The probation officer needs skill in working with both individuals and groups that influence the delinquent's adjustment.

Reference is made to this in the working paper, "The Training Needs of Probation Officers": "The social restoration of a delinquent requires modifying interrelationships in such a way that they can support the erstwhile delinquent in socially acceptable functioning. This involves work not only with the delinquent but with the persons and agencies who are actually significant in his life space." [16]

In communication

Being able to express oneself clearly and concisely in letters, in reports, and orally is a necessary skill. Court reports should be concise and nontechnical. Since the report made by the probation officer to the court is of vital importance, it should be carefully thought through, whether delivered orally or in written form. Effective communication is based on the thinking which precedes the talking or the writing.

The ability to talk with others, to gain their ideas and to impart one's own, needs to be matched with an understanding that there is also communication through behavior. For example, the delinquent may express his reaction to referral to court by the way he slumps in his chair, or glares, or cowers. These gross examples point up the value of observation; other

[16] See working paper in Appendix, "The Training Needs of Probation Officers," p. 66.

examples of communication are the handshake, the smile, and the pat on the back.

Communicating with clients or probationers and parents of different background and experience than one's own is a frequent requirement of the probation officer. Being able to adjust to these differences and to gain rapport with those from another subculture will be based in part on the probation officer's knowledge and acceptance of values other than those of his own culture. This does not mean that he accepts delinquent behavior if the culture of the delinquent approves it, but that he recognizes that the subcultures within a community do have different values. Means need to be found through which the delinquent can conform within the patterns based on his cultural experience.

In organization of work

Probation caseloads are frequently high. This means careful scheduling of interviews in the office, of visits to clients and collaterals, of court hearings, dictation, and time for important community responsibilities. It also means that the probation officer should plan a continuous review of his caseload in order that those ready for release are terminated; he should be geared to meet the emergencies that arise, as emergencies can be used for treatment purposes. Thus, establishing job priorities and remaining flexible enough to meet unexpected developments are needed skills.

In using authority

With authority there is the responsibility of both controlling the acting-out of the delinquent and of permitting sufficient leeway for the youth to grow into healthy independence. Maintaining the proper balance of control can determine the success or failure of the individualized probation program.

Control of the delinquent is not affected by just telling him what to do. In most cases, he has been frequently admonished before he came to court. The probation officer's job is to analyze how authority can be used to assist this particular delinquent. He needs also to know the authority actually assigned to him as a probation officer. What is his area of responsibility? What are the decisions for which he is responsible?

Power has within it the ability to corrupt. The probation officer, while in this position of power and authority, should use his supervisory position to influence and to guide, and as

necessary, to direct. Authority, properly used, will assist the delinquent in perceiving the fairness of the judgments made on his behavior. If his earlier experience with authority has taught him that those in power are hypocritical and untrustworthy, an opportunity is available to correct this belief. Bluffing or threats may have the ring of authority, but such devices are often perceived by the delinquent. If the probation officer is not sincere, not on the level, the delinquent has no model to choose in order to change his values.

The probation officer needs to believe in the fact that discipline is treatment. Holding the probationer to his responsibilities should not be viewed as punitive. When necessary action is taken to control the delinquent, this should be based on a fair appraisal of what is best for him and for the community, on the basis of what resources are available for dealing with his particular problem.

In observation and evaluation

Seeing and interpreting the behavior of the teenager calls for theoretical knowledge of the dynamics of behavior. Recognition of the individual's own response to trauma, to stress, or to everyday situations is essential in planning with him and others concerned about him. An evaluation of the success of treatment efforts is needed to determine progress—or lack of it—or failure.

Workshop participants pointed out that some probation officers are able to secure data for the social study and from them devise helpful treatment plans. Their difficulty, however, is in carrying out these plans with the delinquent. To a degree, this gap between the ability to make a study and to carry out the recommendations was laid to the fact that the professional literature has concentrated on diagnostic considerations and has been much less explicit regarding treatment techniques. Lack of other services and facilities is another factor.

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Because the workshop participants used most of their time to discuss the job of the probation officer, there was not enough time to discuss in detail the ways of stimulating training, the techniques of training or what its content should be. The general conclusion of the meeting was that the field needs to become aware of what additional knowledge, skills, and attitudes are needed by the probation officers. Social work training was seen as generic preparation, but it was believed that the curriculum should be enriched with materials from the delinquency field—materials that have significance not only for probation officers, but that would benefit all social workers dealing with youth.

The participants believed that social workers going into the field of service to delinquents were not prepared as well for this setting as social workers going into other fields (such as medical social work or child welfare). Until recently, many of the schools of social work were reluctant to examine training needs in this field. However, recent trends indicate a growing interest in the entire field of corrections and a willingness to plan with agencies for professional preparation for students interested in working with juvenile delinquents. The participants saw social work education as the basic ingredient in training for the probation officer's job because of the knowledge of human behavior and of effective ways of dealing with it which is learned by the social work student.

In the working paper, "The Training Needs of Probation Officers," many of the problems of education and training are discussed under the heading "Educational Organization." As a supplement to that presentation, the following ideas, discussed by the participants, are listed under the appropriate heading.

Graduate education

Graduate education should provide the student with the basic body of knowledge, attitudes, and skill needed to develop a generalized

mode of approach, a way of solving social problems; staff development aids in the application of these approaches in dealing with the specific problems that obtain in a given social agency or court. Thus, academic preparation should have these characteristics:

1. Developing approaches to problems which cannot be effectively acquired on the job. Concepts are taught rather than facts, principles rather than techniques.
2. Developing changes in thinking, feeling, and doing.
3. Developing a scientific and attitudinal base for practice.
4. Learning experiences in both theory (classroom) and practice (fieldwork).[17]

To improve the graduate offerings for the student who goes into probation, the workshop participants recommended that the curriculum include greater depth of content by—

1. Using more case material regarding delinquents in the methods courses. All social workers need to know the legal aspects of work with juveniles, how to work with other personnel, and the proper use of authority.
   a. Introducing more materials in the social service sequence regarding delinquency, correctional agencies, and related issues.
   b. Including more information, concepts, and principles in the human growth and development sequence regarding antisocial behavior.
2. Seeking faculty with corrections experience. When such faculty have responsibility for field placements, their perception of the needs of the court staff rises. The benefits to the school derive from the case material which enriches the social work curriculum; the benefits to the court derive from the ideas educators offer toward improving services.
3. Including more correctional publications in the library and using references from these on the appropriate course bibliographies.
4. Including material regarding how to sell a program to the important interests of the community.

Training in particular aspects of the probation job was seen as an agency task; schools of social work can only hope to turn out individuals who are well prepared to utilize such training.

---

[17] Boehm, op. cit., p. 65–67.

Schools of social work state that they attempt to lay the groundwork in order to prepare the student for a great variety of tasks, under various auspices, and in various agencies. They are aware that university officials still wonder if what the student learns today in social work or in other professions is in the realm of narrow technique which could and should be learned on the job.[18] Here the school is caught on the one side by the agencies and the field of practice who urge better defined courses that will train the student to be a competent practitioner in a given speciality upon graduation, and on the other side by the university which requires that a liberal education is insured for the student.

The participants recommended that the schools of social work and the agencies serving delinquents meet to work out problems now existing regarding the acceptance of students interested in delinquency into the graduate program. Greater flexibility was urged, as in the number of hours that can be taken per semester and the variety of field placements required. One group also suggested that the time allowed for obtaining the master's degree be extended, thus removing the requirement that all work for the degree must be completed within 5 years of enrollment in graduate school. However, it was recognized that this greater flexibility should not include exposing the student to greater demands in terms of both study and job performance than he was able to handle. Within this discussion the needs and demands of the field were heard at the expense of an awareness of the educational problems faced by the schools in maintaining academic standards.

Undergraduate education

Since the participants believed that graduate education is necessary for adequate preparation for a probation officer, and since time had to be budgeted, brief attention was paid to the requirements of the undergraduate program. One group pointed out that emphasis in the undergraduate program is on certain areas of knowledge plus some beginning work on attitudes, but with no attempt to develop skills in practice. Almost exclusive emphasis was on the knowledge component with recognition that the attitudes and skills can best be handled in job field training and graduate training, including fieldwork. Final emphasis was placed on the role of undergraduate education in integrating the contribution of the behavioral sciences, sociology, psychology, anthropology, political science, as they are related to social work practice and problems.

---

[18] Boehm, op. cit., p. 60, 61.

143

It was agreed that while undergraduate training did not provide interviewing skills, it sensitized the new probation officer to the needs of such skills. It also sensitized him to the need and use of community resources and prepared him in part for this. In addition, he came with some understanding of personality dynamics at an elementary level; however, he did not come with sufficient understanding of the nature and range of delinquency encountered in a court workload. It was agreed that a student with such an undergraduate background came with some intellectualized concepts about the attitudes of objectivity, commitment to serve, and being nonjudgmental, but that these really had to be tested out, explored, and taught in practice.

Another of the work groups discussed whether different role and task differentiation might be based on differences in educational background. One tack that the discussion took concerned the question of how to make optimal use of persons with different educational backgrounds; that is, undergraduate training or full professional training. Some questions were raised about the structural implications and the possibilities of differential task assignments for probation staff in terms of their varied skills and training. Many of the group members did not accept the notion of possible redivision or division of staff based on differential task assignments in the supervision of cases, that is, the carrying of the probation caseload, and this discussion was not pursued further.

Inservice training

The emphasis of the court's staff development program differs from that of the undergraduate and graduate schools. The latter have a broad, educational focus. The former has its focus related to its function. The court has responsibility for a staff development program that meets the needs of all of its members. Frequently this means a diversified program to serve (1) the new employee, (2) the experienced employee, (3) the untrained probation officer, (4) the professionally qualified probation officer, and (5) combinations of these. Thus a training unit (or staff group) is one device that can be used to form a homogeneous group, so that each unit can proceed on the basis of its own knowledge and needs.

An inservice training program which was discussed by one group focused on the following areas:

1. Communication, not only in word but also in manner and style. The provision of service and treatment by casework methods stressed attitudes rather than substantive knowledge.

2. Detailed information regarding the court's policies and procedures and the ways used to deal with everyday problems.
3. Familiarity with the role of others frequently involved in cases. What are the varied responsibilities of the lawyer, the judge, the police, the district attorney, the school worker?
4. The history of the court and its place in the community. This frequently instills a strong feeling of pride in the court's work and a sense of identity with it.
5. Theoretical knowledge regarding the span of behavior considered normal.

Workshop participants described a wide range of programs—from brief orientation to an ambitious and progressive 9-month program. Some courts have programs similar to that of many private social agencies. These included case presentations and discussion, lectures from authorities in special fields, and discussions of administrative problems.

Supervision

Probably the major portion of inservice training is assigned to the supervisor, who has the best opportunity to measure the needs of the job and of the particular probation officer. Unfortunately, well-qualified, competent supervisors are in short supply. However, it is the supervisor who really defines the job expectations and who evaluates the probation officer's work. He can outline the areas of strength in practice and also the areas where more knowledge and skill are needed in order to be effective in his service.

The supervisor was identified as the key person to assess the educational needs of the officer—though the administrator was also seen as legitimately performing this function under certain circumstances. It followed then, in the opinion of the group, that the supervisor must be allotted time and opportunity for performing this service and that it must be seen as a necessary function of his job rather than a low-priority addendum. From this, it followed that it was the obligation of the administrator to structure the supervisory role so that one of the expectations was for the supervisor to regard the probation officer from the viewpoint of those deficiencies which might be remedied by appropriate education. Along these lines, there was some recognition that the supervisor often feels caught in the middle between his loyalties to the administrator and the probation officers, but this point was not developed. These supervisory obligations were defined in terms of psychological variables as the tasks of creating

some—but not too much—dependency on the part of the probation officer with respect to the supervisor so that the probation officer was appropriately amenable to the supervisor's efforts to help him remedy his work deficiencies. It was also recognized that the colleague group of probation officers constituted an extremely important evaluation group for setting and maintaining norms.

The question was raised by one of the leaders as to what techniques might successfully operate to deal with the seriously deficient worker who is not readily amenable to remedying his deficiencies? Several of the techniques which were mentioned were isolating him so that the group is insulated from him, or assigning him a specialized caseload which increased the possibilities that his deficiencies would be less damaging to some clients and perhaps helpful to others. Perhaps inservice training and on-the-job development could not be expected to exert a very great effect on such a worker.

Orientation

Orientation, as a part of inservice training, is needed by all new staff members. It should include the philosophy of the court and its legal base, administrative controls, procedures, and clerical matters. While much of this can be covered in manuals of procedure, the new employee also needs "live" presentations. One useful device for introduction is to "walk a case through" the administrative sequence from the point of intake to the ultimate disposition of the case. Additional suggestions for the orientation period included: activities of the juvenile police officers; a tour of the neighborhoods of highest incidence of delinquency; and visits to selected schools, detention home, State training schools, and other agencies frequently serving delinquent youth.

Sequential orientation for each new officer should be related to his own understanding of what the job is and what he personally brings to it. This often takes place in discussion with the supervisor, but some aspects of it can be handled appropriately in a group. Obviously, the initial orientation is related closely to the job and is geared toward the ongoing inservice training program. The task of the orientation period is to help the probation officer find his place in the agency and to clarify his role and responsibilities.

Agency responsibility

The effective contribution of an inservice training program to the court's objectives depends on the soundness of the administrative

framework under which it operates. How job responsibilities are organized, defined, and sanctioned are the crucial determinants for the type of performance expected of staff; training is developed to help staff achieve the objectives as expressed in job descriptions.

For a successful program, the administrator or chief probation officer must see the need for training and for professional competence, and be wholly committed to it. The judge also must back the training program aggressively by fighting for sufficient appropriations.

In order to influence court policies and procedures, the training program should be an integral part of administration. It should be so placed in the administrative structure that it will receive its proper share of the court's resources. Time and personnel, as well as finances, need to be budgeted for training sessions.

By hiring qualified workers and providing training opportunities to all probation officers, the court gives impetus to the program. However, even with a strong backing for an adequate inservice training program, a number of problems were recognized that need analysis and solution.

Among these are:

Should attendance at inservice training sessions be compulsory in the face of the demands of excessive caseloads? If not, then should attendance be considered when promotions or evaluations are made?

How can levels of competence be defined and training established for officers of different levels?

How can the effect of inservice training be measured?

To what extent and in what ways should staff members participate in the formulation and the execution of staff development activities?

How can the older, experienced probation officer's resistance to training and supervision be resolved?

Pat answers to these questions would be a disservice, since court situations vary. The satisfactory solution found in the large court might be of little use in the small court. However, in the answers there are some guidelines that are useful in considering these problems

Question 1. If inservice training is not required, this is evidence that the court is not sufficiently convinced that improved service will result from training sessions. Probation practice is such that officers have little time to schedule for extras. If

training is considered an extra, only a portion of the staff will find the time available for it. Promotions will be discussed under a separate heading.

Question 2. Evaluations of performance and judgment of educational qualifications and work experience are helpful in determining levels of competence. If the staff is large enough, homogeneous learning groups can be formed to study problems in which they are particularly interested.

Question 3. Staff reactions, or outside observations of given programs, have usually served as measuring rods for court in-service training programs. An attempt is made to judge whether or not service to the delinquent and the community has improved as the result of the training program.

Question 4. Many courts have a staff development committee. The chief probation officer, or the training officer, or one of the supervisors is usually the chairman of such a committee. In small courts, the responsibility for staff training falls on the chief probation officer.

Question 5. This recurring question seems particularly difficult to resolve. Recognition of the contribution that the older, experienced officer can make regarding the resources and facilities of the community and the State has sometimes been an opening wedge to his participation in staff development programs. As his contributions are accepted and used, he is in turn able to accept the contributions of other and newer staff members.

Other training opportunities

In addition to the training opportunities already mentioned, there are workshops and institutes offered by universities, professional associations, and State and national organizations. Extension courses are available through the universities in some localities and work-study programs have been planned between some courts and schools of social work. Some courts provide scholarships for graduate training and are able to keep students on partial salary during their graduate training; others offer educational leave.

Extensive discussion by one group developed strong statements concerning the responsibility of schools of social work, courts, professional organizations, and units of government in providing workers with the opportunity to obtain professional training.

1. Courts have a definite and unquestionable obligation to engage at some level in training both workers and students. This training obligation is felt to exist both at the graduate and undergraduate levels through mutual agreement between the courts and the schools.

2. Both courts and schools have the obligation to explore, evaluate, and adopt the most suitable method by which untrained workers may obtain necessary additional professional training. Some of the methods suggested are: (*a*) work study programs; (*b*) educational leave; (*c*) student stipends. Further, courts, schools, governmental units, and professional organizations should work together to provide plans which enable eligible workers to obtain professional education.

3. Since civil service examinations often determine the character of individuals hired for probation jobs, schools of social work and courts should get together and attempt to work into civil service examinations characteristics which are admissible of testing, as well as tests which will uncover the attitudes and potentials which are felt to be desirable in the probation officer.

One avenue of discussion led to consideration of what fuller use might be made of the schools, both graduate and undergraduate. Summer workshops for untrained workers were seen as a possible stimulus for full-time graduate education as well as a possible source of pulling in basic important knowledge areas for the college graduate probation officer. With such summer workshops placed at a school of social work, the attempt might be to establish a professional social work identification. A focus on content to fill gaps in basic knowledge areas (developed in an undergraduate school) might have somewhat different consequences, yet still meet the college-trained beginning probation officer's needs. Also, a suggestion was made that there should be summer workshops and institutes for trained workers, and that workshops should concentrate on the use of authority in a variety of settings as well as the probation setting. Other workshops centering on such areas as law, court structure, and community organization were viewed as possible training sources.

There was some discussion of the possible development of extension courses which might move into such areas as human growth and behavior and basic personality dynamics in filling gaps in the undergraduate training of the college graduate probation officer. Particular emphasis was put on the need of workshops, institutes, and various training devices for supervisors. It became increasingly clear

that the group recognized that professional training is necessary for the task of supervision.

The next areas pursued were part-time courses in schools of social work and various arrangements that might be possible to bring more probation officers into part-time and full-time social work training.

In the concluding remarks there was some discussion of how to discover and utilize untapped resources in the educational field. These resources might include both graduate and undergraduate departments outside of the field of social work. Such departments as political science, history, economics, law, sociology, and psychology could at times be effectively involved in particular training programs. The group recognized such educational developments could be very helpful to the probation officer in developing better understanding of the political structure of the community, its economic organization, and the general bureaucratic organization of modern community life. This teaching was viewed as a two-way process which might lead to enlightenment and a broadened viewpoint for the educators in these fields about the nature and practice of courts and social agencies, as well as leading to valuable contributions of their knowledge to the probation officer's task at hand. Such contacts with undergraduate and graduate educators might be a fruitful source for recruitment for the probation field in view of the educator's wide contact with students. It was also noted that the range of research needs in probation might fruitfully be explored by some of these specialists.

Promotion

Participants held different views regarding the relationship between promotional opportunities and training. All agreed that promotion should be based on ability and that it was recognition of a job well done. Some disagreed when it was proposed that additional education should be required in order to advance. The contention was that once minimum standards are set for a line probation position, all persons possessing them who are hired should be eligible for promotion to the top of the probation positions, irrespective of any subsequent changes in educational or training qualifications for hiring. Persons who believed that advancement should be linked to educational qualifications stated that any unfairness to the potential employee was overcome when he was informed that advancement beyond a certain point was contingent on the acquisition of further skills through advanced training and education.

THE IMAGE OF THE PROBATION OFFICER

What does a probation officer do? How much is he paid? What status does he have in the community? Answers to these familiar questions frame the general concept of a probation officer. At the time that attempts are made to recruit young people into a career to serve delinquents, these same prospects are considering other vocational opportunities as well. How they choose is vitally important to the field.

Generally, the role of the probation officer as a social worker can be sufficiently described to impart the necessary information to persons considering this profession as a career. There is frequently warm response to the intangible rewards that come from serving people in trouble. But other professions or occupations also offer similar rewards, and pay more. If probation service is really valuable, why doesn't it pay well? Is probation work like teaching has been—that is, the probation officer is respected, but overworked and underpaid?

If a probation officer needs the education described, why doesn't he get a salary commensurate with his knowledge and skills? Who would stay long on a job that devalued his contribution? Arthur Kruse has pointed out that "Unless there is a motivation based on something unique such as exists in a religious order, the economics of an occupation must reflect its true worth and also enable it to compete for talent on this basis. It is fine to say that man does not live by food, clothing, and shelter alone, but this depends on whether or not one has food, clothing, and shelter. Likewise, if the economics of a profession are submarginal, then this fact alone takes on a significance all out of proportion to the other values which might be important." [19]

[19] Arthur Kruse: An Appraisal of the Kind of Talent That Is Apt To Be Attracted by the Present Status of Social Work Practice. EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL WORK. Proceedings of Eighth Annual Program Meeting. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1960. 186 pp. (p. 72–80).

The very fact that there is such a serious gap between the needs of the field and the supply of qualified probation officers points up that the image of the probation officer has not been sufficiently attractive to draw the personnel needed; nor has it been able to hold the personnel it has recruited. Staff turnover is a serious problem in many courts. "High turnover," comments Mr. Kruse, "is completely incompatible with the concept of a profession with requirements of substantial competence and long years of professional educational preparation." [20]

How can the job of the probation officer be made attractive so as to recruit people to it? was the question posed by one group. This was answered in part by pointing up the necessity of identifying and interpreting the actual contribution the probation officer makes to individuals and to the community. To complement this, better working conditions, reasonable caseloads, and adequate remuneration are necessary. Identification with the ongoing efforts of the social work profession and participation in the professional organization, the National Association of Social Workers, were seen as ways of pointing up the values that the probation officer upholds.

Another group, recognizing that the image of the probation officer is much in need of burnishing and status upgrading, referred to the skills and special techniques of the competent practitioner. They proudly referred to the diagnostic acuity needed, the flexibility and stamina required to ride with a difficult case through thick and thin, and the versatility of techniques used. In bolstering the role of the probation officer, the group enumerated the various possibilities the field opens up to use environmental change as a therapeutic method and to use community resources with imagination.

Pride in the job was evident, but the group found this difficult to articulate. Like many public servants, the probation officers tend to derogate themselves. The very fact that they are employees rather than independent professionals in private practice tends to make them feel they are in a lower status group. However, the authority delegated to them, the nature of the job required of them, and the satisfactions attainable in the performance of the job—all are a part of the positive aspects of the probation officer's job.

Participants differed as to where the field is in constructing a model of the probation officer. Even though a variety of models apparently exist, an ideal model is being constructed. This ideal model pictures the probation officer as a professional person responsible for studying the individual and the situation, for recommending the ap-

[20] Kruse, op. cit., p. 76.

propriate social treatment for the delinquent, and for effecting such treatment when it is within his function. This model should be adapted from social work.

The status of a profession is determined primarily by its contributions to society. The performance of the individual within the profession usually determines his status. It follows, then, that to upgrade the status or the image of the probation officer, improved performance is required. This can be promoted through an insistence on standards developed to meet the true needs of the job. (Standards for specialized courts dealing with children have been published, but have not yet been used as widely as needed.) Improved service to children will result as more personnel serving them gain the knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish the task.

COMMENTS

The report of the workshop points up that the participants had difficulty in dealing with the problems of training, since they found it necessary to first agree on a definition of probation. The varying opinions and attitudes that were expressed offered ample evidence of the fact that probation is still in a transitional phase. Though some practitioners held that the functions of the probation officer had been established in various standard setting publications, others felt with those representatives outside the field of practice that these standards had not been fully accepted. This would seem to indicate the need for more involvement of those people outside the field of practice in the development of standard setting material by those in practice; it also indicates the need for more study of actual practice on the part of educators.

The various viewpoints expressed at the workshop revealed these major areas of difference which need clarification:

To what degree is the probation officer a therapist? Is the goal of probation the stopping of delinquent behavior, or is it social rehabilitation?

To what degree is the probation officer a change agent? What is his role in the community?

How can the probation officer's job be structured so that there are appropriate functions defined for both professional and non-professional personnel? Should there be a separate treatment unit in the court for those delinquents who require professional help?

SUGGESTED READING

(Starred publications were recommended for the participants and staff in preparation for the workshop)

Aptekar, Herbert H.: The Continued Education of Experienced Workers. CHILD WELFARE, 1959, 38:7–12 (February).

*Boehm, Werner W.: Objectives of the Social Work Curriculum of the Future. Vol. I in SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM STUDY. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1959. 291 pp.

California Youth Authority: STANDARDS FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF PROBATION DUTIES. 1954. Sacramento: Department of the Youth Authority, 28 pp.

Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: ADMINISTRATION AND STAFF TRAINING IN INSTITUTIONS FOR JUVENILE DELINQUENTS. Children's Bureau Publication No. 377. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. 47 pp.

Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: STAFF TRAINING FOR PERSONNEL IN INSTITUTIONS FOR JUVENILE DELINQUENTS. Children's Bureau Publication No. 364. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958. 56 pp.

*Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: STANDARDS FOR SPECIALIZED COURTS DEALING WITH CHILDREN. Children's Bureau Publication No. 346. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954. 99 pp.

HG
55

*Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: TRAINING PERSONNEL FOR WORK WITH JUVENILE DELINQUENTS. Children's Bureau Publication No. 348. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954. 90 pp.

Dailey, Wilda J., and Hogan, Virginia Pettit: Brief Recording and Supervision. SOCIAL CASEWORK, 1958, 39: 278–282 (May).

Diana, Lewis: What Is Probation? JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICE SCIENCE, 1960, 51: 189–208 (July–August).

Fenlason, Anne F.: ESSENTIALS IN INTERVIEWING. New York: Harper & Bros., 1952. 352 pp.

Fizdale, Ruth: Peer Group Supervision. SOCIAL CASEWORK, 1958, 39: 443–450 (October).

Grossbard, Hyman: Methodology for Developing Self-Awareness. SOCIAL CASEWORK, 1954, 35: 380–386 (November).

Hamilton, Gordon: PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL CASE RECORDING. New York: Columbia University Press, 1946. 142 pp.

Hamilton, Gordon: Self-Awareness in Professional Education. SOCIAL CASEWORK, 1954, 35: 371–379 (November).

Hardman, Dale: Authority in Casework—A Bread and Butter Theory. NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION JOURNAL, 1959, 5: 249–255 (July).

Hardman, Dale: The Function of the Probation Officer. FEDERAL PROBATION, 1960, 24: 3–10 (September).

Hess, Loren J.: A Graduate School and Court Cooperate in Training for Probation Work. FEDERAL PROBATION, 1951, 15: 28–32 (June).

Johnson, Kenneth D.: The Professional Schools Face the Challenge of Correctional Work. FOCUS, 1950, 29: 1–7 (September).

Kruse, Arthur: An Appraisal of the Kind of Talent That Is Apt To Be Attracted by the Present Status of Social Work Practice. EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL WORK. Proceedings of Eighth Annual Program Meeting, Council on Social Work Education. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1960. 186 pp. (pp. 72–80).

Leeds, Clarence M.: Probation Work Requires Special Training. FEDERAL PROBATION, 1951, 15: 25–28 (June).

Lippitt, R., Watson, Jeanne, and Westley B.: THE DYNAMICS OF PLANNED CHANGE. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1958. 312 pp.

Nagel, William G.: The "Accused" Child: The Role of Authority in Treatment. CHILD WELFARE, 1959, 38: 23–27 (July).

National Probation and Parole Association: STANDARD FAMILY COURT ACT. New York: National Probation and Parole Association, 1959. 64 pp.

National Probation and Parole Association: STANDARD JUVENILE COURT ACT. (Sixth edition.) New York: National Probation and Parole Association, 1959. 71 pp.

Nelson, Elmer K.: The Gulf Between Theory and Practice in Corrections. FEDERAL PROBATION, 1954, 18: 48–50 (September).

Ohlin, Lloyd E., Piven, Herman, and Pappenfort, Donnell M.: Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole. NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION JOURNAL, 1956, 2: 211–225 (July).

Piven, Herman, and Pappenfort, Donnell M.: Strain Between Administrator and Worker: A View From the Field of Corrections. SOCIAL WORK, 1960, 5: 37–45 (October).

Prigmore, Charles S.: A State In-service Training Program. NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION JOURNAL, 1956, 2: 247–254 (July).

Report of the Advisory Committee on Social Welfare Education: SOCIAL WORKERS FOR CALIFORNIA. 1960. 37 pp. (September).

Roach, S. Jerome, and Cranefield, Eleanor G.: THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF PERSONNEL IN THE FIELD OF CORRECTIONS. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1956. 20 pp.

Sedio, Edward, Nelson, Gordon, and Compton, Beulah: Social Work Student Placement in a Probation Setting. NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION JOURNAL, 1956, 2: 233–238 (July).

Studt, Elliot: A School of Social Work Builds a Program for Correctional Personnel. NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION JOURNAL, 1956, 2: 226–232 (July).

Studt, Elliot: An Outline for Study of Social Authority Factors in Casework. SOCIAL CASEWORK, 1954, 35: 231–238 (June).

Studt, Elliot: Learning Casework in a Juvenile Probation Setting. SOCIAL CASEWORK, 1951, 32: 343–350 (October).

*Studt, Elliott: Education for Social Workers in the Correctional Field. Vol. V in SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM STUDY. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1959. 50 pp.

Studt, Elliot: The Contribution of Correctional Practice to Social Work Theory and Education. SOCIAL CASEWORK, 1956, 37: 263–269 (June).

Studt, Elliot: Worker-Client Authority Relationships in Social Work. SOCIAL WORK, 1959, 4: 18–28 (January).

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: CALIFORNIA GUIDE FOR TRAINING ANALYSIS. 1956. 13 pp.

Wallinga, Jack V.: The Probation Officer's Role in Psychiatric Cases. JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICE SCIENCE, 1959, 50: 364–367.

Wasserman, Paul: DECISION MAKING. Ithaca, New York: Cornell School of Business and Public Administration, 1958. 111 pp.

Weisman, Irving, and Chwast, Jacob: Control and Value in Social Work Treatment. SOCIAL CASEWORK, 1960, 41: 451–456 (November).

Younghusband, Eileen L.: The Dilemma of the Juvenile Court. SOCIAL SERVICE REVIEW, 1959, 33: 10–20 (March).

Younghusband, Eileen L.: REPORT ON A SURVEY OF SOCIAL WORK IN THE FIELD OF CORRECTIONS. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1960. 24 pp.

APPENDIX

Planning committee

Mrs. Alice Taylor Davis
Lecturer in Social Work
School of Social Work
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Bernard Kogon
Director of Training Section
Probation Office
Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. Tully McCrea
Field Consultant
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
Austin, Tex.

Mr. Ben S. Meeker
Chief Probation Officer
Northern District Court
U.S. Probation Office
Chicago, Ill.

Miss Ann Elizabeth Neely
Consultant on Program Services
Council on Social Work Education
345 East 46th Street
New York 17, N.Y.

Mrs. Ruth Melcher
Casework Supervisor
Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court
Cleveland, Ohio

Mr. Bernard Russell [1]
Chief, Training Branch
Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service
Children's Bureau
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington 25, D.C.

[1] Mr. Russell directed the first phase of the project, resigning in May 1960. Merritt Gilman was appointed Chief of the Training Branch in September 1960, and wrote the report with Alice Low from the leaders' minutes of the group meetings.

594

Dr. Douglas A. Sargent [2]
Wayne County Juvenile Court
1025 East Forest Avenue
Detroit, Mich.

Prof. Irving Weisman [2]
Louis M. Rabinowitz School of Social Work
Hunter College
New York, N.Y.

Mr. John A. Wallace
Director, Probation Department
Supreme Bench of Baltimore City
Court House
Baltimore, Md.

Miss Grace White
Consultant
Council on Social Work Education
345 East 46th Street
New York 17, N.Y.

Leaders

Dr. Hyman Frankel
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
44 East 23d Street
New York, N.Y.

Mr. Paul Kalin
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
Midwestern Office
1536 Vincennes Avenue
Chicago Heights, Ill.

Dr. Girard Franklin
7 West 96th Street
New York, N.Y.

Prof. Herman Piven
School of Social Welfare
University of California
Los Angeles, Calif.

Resource people

Mr. Edgar W. Brewer [3]
Western Director
Field Services
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
821 Market Street
San Francisco, Calif.

[2] Also served as a leader of the workshop.
[3] Served as Children's Bureau staff member for the Planning Committee until December 1959.

Mr. Alan Fite
Council on Social Work Education
345 East 46th Street
New York 17, N.Y.

Mr. William H. Sheridan
Assistant Director
Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service
Children's Bureau
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington 25, D.C.

Staff

Dr. Charles B. Brink
Dean, School of Social Work
Wayne State University
Detroit, Mich.

Miss Frances Gardner
Secretary, Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service
Children's Bureau
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington 25, D.C.

Mrs. Alice M. Low
Consultant, Training Branch
Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service
Children's Bureau
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington 25, D.C.

Mr. Pat O. Mancini
Juvenile Courts and Probation Consultant
Technical Aid Branch
Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service
Children's Bureau
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington 25, D.C.

Participants

Mr. Loren A. Beckley
Chief Probation Officer
Probation Department and Juvenile Hall
Belmont, Calif.

Miss Mary Elizabeth Begg
Assistant Professor
School of Social Work
Loyola University
Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Mario D'Angeli
Assistant Professor
San Francisco State College
San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. Andrew J. DeSanti
Assistant Chief of Probation Services
Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court
Cleveland, Ohio

Miss Clarice Freud
Professor of Social Work
School of Social Work
Frieze Building
Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mr. Jewel Goddard
Case Supervisor
Lane County Juvenile Department
Eugene, Oreg.

Mr. David H. Gronewold
Associate Professor
School of Social Work
University of Washington
Seattle, Wash.

Miss Margaret E. Hanna
Assistant Director
Dependency and Neglect Department
Wayne County Juvenile Court
Detroit, Mich.

Mr. Dale G. Hardman
Assistant Professor
School of Social Work
University of Missouri
Columbia, Mo.

Mr. C. B. Hayslett
Director, Division of Juvenile Probation
Department of Correction
State Office Building
Nashville, Tenn.

Mr. William Hoffman
Assistant Director
Detention and Corrections Authority
St. Paul, Minn.

Mr. Wayne Keyser
Deputy Director of Training
Federal Probation Training Center
U.S. District Court
Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Bernard Kogon
Director of Training Section
Probation Office
Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. John P. O'Brien
Administrative Assistant
Juvenile Division
Circuit Court
St. Louis, Mo.

Miss Margaret S. Perrin
Chief Juvenile Probation Officer
Delaware County Juvenile Court Home
Media, Pa.

Mr. Charles S. Prigmore
Associate Professor
School of Social Welfare
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, La.

Mr. William L. Quirk
Deputy Director of Probation
Probation Department
Supreme Bench of Baltimore City
Baltimore, Md.

Mr. Kenneth Ramminger
Juvenile Court Consultant
State Department of Public Welfare
Division of Children and Youth
Madison, Wis.

Miss Dorothy R. Roeser
Assistant Professor
The Worden School of Social Service
Our Lady of the Lake College
San Antonio, Tex.

Mr. Herschel Saucier
Juvenile Delinquency Consultant
Department of Public Welfare
Jackson, Miss.

Mr. Edgar Silverman
Assistant Director of Social Work
Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Rex A. Skidmore
Dean, Graduate School of Social Work
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Mrs. Grace McCastline Waite
Assistant Professor of Social Work
School of Public Administration and Social Service
New York University
New York, N.Y.

Mr. Kenneth R. Young
Supervisor
Juvenile Probation Division
Hennepin County Department of Court Services
Minneapolis, Minn.

TRAINING FOR PROBATION

BERNARD RUSSELL

Chief, Training Branch
(July 1957–May 1960)
Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service
Children's Bureau
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

While there are generally accepted standards for professional preparation for the job of probation officer, the last word has not yet been said or written. The national organizations [1] most concerned with this problem have agreed that "The standard of training for probation work should be graduation from an accredited graduate school of social work." But the lack of trained social workers, and the lack of universal acceptance of this standard, has made the personnel picture a very confused one.

Let us examine briefly the development of these standards. Their development extended over a period of years and were sometimes produced independently in different parts of the country.[2] As far back as 1923, serious consideration was being given to this matter. The following is a partial listing of this development:

1923 "Juvenile Court Standards," Report of the Committee appointed by the Children's Bureau, August 1921, to formulate juvenile court standards, Washington, D.C., May 18, 1923, Children's Bureau Publication No. 121, Reprinted 1948. p. 7.

The minimum qualifications of probation officers should be as follows:

a. Education: preferably graduation from college or its equivalent, or from a school of social work.

b. Experience: at least 1 year in casework under supervision.

---

[1] Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, National Probation and Parole Association.

[2] From an unpublished compilation assembled by Edgar Brewer, Juvenile Courts and Probation Consultant, Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service, Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

1945 "Standards for the Selection of Probation and Parole Officers," National Probation Association, p. 9.

> "The best training for probation and parole work is in a graduate school of social work."

1953 "Recommended Standards for Services for Delinquent Children," a Children's Bureau publication (1953), describing standards extracted from the publications of—

> The National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency, 1946;
>
> The Children's Bureau;
>
> The Conference on Delinquency Control, 1952;
>
> The Judicial Conference of the United States, 1942;
>
> The National Probation and Parole Association; and
>
> The Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1950,

states the following on page 4:

> "A probation officer should have, as a minimal requirement for appointment to his position, a bachelor's degree from a college or university of recognized standing, with specialization in the social sciences. Ideally, the probation officer should have his master's degree from an accredited school of social work."

1954 "Standards for Specialized Courts Dealing With Children," prepared by the Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the National Probation and Parole Association and the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, states the following on page 86:

> "The standard of training for probation work should be graduation from an accredited graduate school of social work. . . . It is particularly important that the director of probation and other supervisory personnel have full professional training."

1954 "Standards for the Performance of Probation Duties," California Youth Authority, page 10:

> Persons entering the field of probation work should meet the following standards: . . .
>
> 2. Education

a. Minimum: graduation from an accredited college or university with a major in the social or political sciences.

b. Desirable: completion of 2 years of graduate training in social casework in an accredited college or university.

3. Additional education or experience.

a. In addition to the minimum educational requirement above, any one of the following alternatives should be met:

(1) Completion of a 1-year graduate curriculum in social work, psychology, sociology, criminology, public administration, or a related field: or

(2) At least 1 year paid, full-time casework experience under competent supervision in a recognized social or correctional agency; or

(3) At least 1 year of satisfactory experience as a counselor in a juvenile hall or correctional program.

1956 "Report of Study of Agency Employment Practices," made by the Subcommittee on Supply of Correctional Personnel, under the auspices of the Council on Social Work Education, which was made on the basis of questionnaires sent to 202 correctional agencies in 1956, states that "graduate training is preferred for 85 percent of the probation and parole caseworkers," and that "in only 8 positions [of those reporting preference for graduate training] was social work not the prescribed or included among the prescribed fields of approved graduate training."

The following examinations of the probation officer's job also gives support to the need for training:

1. From "Guides for Juvenile Court Judges," a manual prepared by the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Association in cooperation with the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, 1957, p. 23:

> "The functions of a probation staff are to make a social study and evaluation of each case coming before the court and to carry out the prescribed treatment in the community for those children and adults placed under their supervision. Probation is the indispensable tool

of the juvenile court. Effective probation depends upon quantity and quality of staff available. The day has passed when the juvenile court has to rely solely on volunteers or upon unqualified persons. The court sees people with many of the most complex problems in human behavior, and the judge's effectiveness in understanding and dealing with them is aided or handicapped by the work of his probation staff. Knowledge of human behavior and problems; skill in effecting relationships with people and inspiring them to make decisions and changes in their attitudes; knowledge and skill in the use of local resources—these are the fundamentals of competency in a probation staff."

2. From California Youth Authority, "Standards for the Performance of Probation Duties," 1954, pp. 18–19:

> "Supervision is the correctional and protective treatment aspect of the probation program and is the ultimate objective of the investigative and selective process which precedes it. . . . It demands not only the proper administrative setting, but also demands a high degree of skill on the part of the probation officer in the use of casework technique in working with the individual and his family as well as most effectively using other community resources in the supervision program."

3. From "Probation Is Casework" (*Federal Probation*, Vol. XII (No. 2), June 1948, p. 54), by Ben Meeker, Chief Probation Officer of the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, where the Federal Probation Service Training Center is located:

> "It is generally recognized that the sound practice of probation requires an ability to use the tools of casework. Perhaps the most important tool of casework is the interview. The art of interviewing is perfected with use, and the scientific skill with which it is used will depend upon the probation officer's breadth of knowledge. The interview is a powerful force, not only for securing information but for constructing and maintaining relationships; for revealing hidden conflicts and hostilities, or latent strengths and capacities; for giving insight and understanding to the probationer; and for furthering the diagnosis, and the constant planning between probation officer and probationer which characterizes effective probation supervision."

It is obvious, then, that these standards were not capriciously set forth nor hurriedly developed. Yet the reality of the present staffing of our juvenile courts forces us to reexamine this whole situation. For across the country, the personnel situation is generally a bleak one. The problems we are faced with begin with the numbers and kinds of people we have available to staff our probation departments. According to estimates of the National Probation and Parole Association, the number of full- and part-time probation officers currently employed is the equivalent of 3,800 probation officers working full time with juvenile delinquents.[3] Actually, since we have no nationwide juvenile court reporting system, this number must be regarded as an educated guess. From a number of compilations made by the Children's Bureau, that figure would seem to be fairly accurate. A more hazardous figure is the estimate of the total number of probation officers required by the courts and probation departments that deal with juvenile delinquents. The best estimates place this figure at an additional 5,300, or a total of 9,100 juvenile probation officers. This figure was reached on the basis of estimates of the volume of juvenile delinquents flowing through courts and the generally accepted workload standard of 50 units per probation officer proposed by the National Probation and Parole Association.

Obviously, these estimates are open to question, but with the present available figures it would be difficult to produce a more sophisticated figure. To reach an unassailable estimate, we would need to know more accurately the total number of delinquents adjudicated by the juvenile courts each year. In addition, it would be helpful if we could refine the standard of 50 units per probation officer. Can the graduate caseworker more effectively rehabilitate his probationers with a smaller, or larger caseload? Can large numbers of selected probationers be seen regularly as part of a group of probationers? Such issues would affect the number of units each probation officer could carry.[4]

---

[3] The best current estimate of the number of probation officers serving juveniles is derived from data supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics 1960 Survey of Social Welfare Manpower. It shows that there are about 4,923 social welfare personnel who work primarily on rendering "court services to children." Excluding from this number a small group of personnel (310) who do not perform probation functions (i.e., statisticians) and another small group (219) who are employed by voluntary agencies, then the remainder of 4,394 are those we generally think of as juvenile probation officers. This includes 771 executive and supervisory employees.

[4] The average workload of juvenile probation officers is roughly 3 times as high as they should be if workloads were reduced to a conservative standard of 50 work units per month per officer. This standard would still allow only about 3 hours per month per child, including traveltime, case recording time, and other duties. Presently only 1 hour per month per child is available. If workloads were reduced to the standard, then an estimated 13,200 probation officers are currently needed. These data were taken from "Comparison of Expenditures and Estimated Standard Costs for Selected Juvenile Delinquency Services," Juvenile Delinquency Facts and Facets No. 10.

68

There has been considerable speculation about the background, education, and training of currently employed probation staff. The most recent and authoritative study [5] of this subject was completed by the Children's Bureau as part of a larger study. Over 2,000 probation officers, including 250 in supervisory positions, from a representative sample of 502 courts across the country were polled as to their educational background. Of this number, 1,729 had a bachelor's degree or more for a total of 86 percent. Ten percent of the total had a master's degree in social work, and 10 percent had a master's degree or more in some other field. Only 14 percent, or 284, had less than a college education, and only 128 of these had no college education.[6] While the percent with full social work training is small (10 percent), the potential for full graduate training represented by the large percentage that is eligible for graduate school is far more encouraging than many so-called "well-informed guesses" led us to believe.

The personnel situation, based on this representative sample, shapes up as follows: there is a small core (10 percent) of staff in courts with the necessary basic education to do the probation job; i.e., graduate social work training. There is another small group (10 percent) with related graduate training. There is a large majority (66 percent) who are potentially eligible for graduate social work training by virtue of the fact that they have achieved a bachelor's degree.

We must now look at the academic means available for training probation officers. While authorities stipulate that the master's degree program in social work is the desirable training, probation officers are also being recruited from three other programs. These are from the master's degree program in sociology, criminology, or public administration which require 1 year of graduate work beyond the bachelor's degree; the 4-year undergraduate program in sociology, criminology, or social science; and the 4-year undergraduate program in social work. These three programs offer, in varying degrees, understanding of criminal justice and its processes, or the structure and operation of correctional agencies, or the processes of social organization. They do not develop the skills and understanding necessary to effectively alter human behavior.

The 55 graduate schools of social work in the United States graduated 1,744 students in 1958. In the same year, there were 4,435 full-time social work students enrolled in those schools, of whom 225

---

[5] Report to the Congress on Juvenile Delinquency, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Children's Bureau and National Institute of Mental Health. 1960. 54 pp.

[6] Survey of Probation Officers, 1959. Children's Bureau Juvenile Delinquency Facts and Facets, No. 15. Washington 25, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960. 24 pp.

were in correctional field placements.[7] Despite a 10–20-percent rise in enrollment for the 1958–59 academic years, it is obvious that graduate schools of social work cannot fill the immediate needs for personnel.

Nor do the related programs at the graduate level produce enough people to fill jobs. Obviously, the field of probation is being forced to recruit from the ranks of the undergraduate programs merely to get enough bodies to fill the vacant positions. What then does this mean for agency inservice training programs that try to fill in the educational gap?

Current agency training programs vary tremendously. In a few States, probation officers have secured stipends from State child welfare programs for graduate training at schools of social work. One school offers National Institute of Mental Health stipends for personnel in the correctional field. In a few scattered schools, personnel from probation secure Office of Vocational Rehabilitation stipends. Until recently, one State offered training grants to probation officers, but these have just been eliminated. For the most part, then, there are few sources of stipends available to employed probation officers.

The inservice training programs that exist in our courts and probation departments have never been adequately catalogued. They range from a brief administrative orientation to an ambitious, progressive 9-month training program. Most courts have at least the first. The new probation officer is taught the use of a number of administrative forms, court procedures, and where to go for what. In addition, some techniques of interviewing, some basic principles of the dynamics of human behavior, and descriptions of available local resources may be imparted to new staff members.

In a much smaller number of courts with well-trained staff, we find attempts to provide an ongoing program of training. These do not vary greatly from inservice training programs of many social agencies that aim to sharpen and refine the casework skills of their professional staff. The programs usually consist of case discussions, sometimes under the leadership of a skilled teacher from outside the agencies. Frequently, lectures and discussions may be offered on various aspects of understanding people. Time is also spent on administrative announcements and concerns.

Perhaps the largest proportion of training that goes on in the courts occurs in the classic one-to-one relationship between the probation officer and his supervisor. Of this we must ask, is it enough?

---

[7] Statistics on Social Work Education—November 1, 1958 and Academic Year 1957–58. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1958. 21 pp.

Even where we have well-trained, competent supervisors, is it enough? The fact is that well-trained, competent supervisors are sadly lacking in our courts. Such factors as reduced caseloads, probation officers with basic training, administrative sanction of time for training are some of the additional basic requirements for an adequate training program.

We have not mentioned a variety of training programs which involve a partnership between agency and school. Short courses, institutes, and workshops may be offered either in the agency or school setting. Personnel from schools may be brought to the agency to conduct training sessions.

Rarely do we see a careful analysis of the training needs of a staff. If these needs were assessed, do we have time or personnel in our courts or available to our courts to carry out the necessary training programs? How successful can the inservice training program be when staff lacks the basic educational equipment? How can the court administrator put aside time for training when staff is already overloaded? What is the responsibility of the agency for training? Of the school?

Thus we recognize that the problems of training are numerous and varied, just as the resources and practices differ widely. Some additional, urgent problems were listed as follows by the committee that first planned this workshop:

1. Should the agency attempt to provide basic training for probation for staff without graduate training?
2. What are the minimum staff qualifications to make an effective training program possible?
3. Can the probation job be divided so that an untrained worker can fill part of the function of the probation officer and the trained worker be used more selectively?
4. How can an agency design a training program to meet the needs of a wide variety of staff?
5. What are the administrative implications of the training program?
6. How can training programs be designed for small agencies?
7. How can employed staff be encouraged to secure graduate training?
8. How can the number of qualified supervisors in courts be increased so that agency and school programs can be effectively maintained?
9. How is inservice training in courts stimulated and organized?

10. Can some criteria be developed for courses on the undergraduate level for people who are planning a career in probation?
11. Can undergraduate sequences be developed without subverting the accepted standard of graduate training?
12. How much expansion can be reasonably expected from schools of social work?
13. How many currently employed probation officers would be eligible for admission to a graduate school of social work?
14. Should schools of social work reevaluate criteria for admission?
15. How can fieldwork placements in courts be increased?
16. What are some of the more productive approaches possible in attempting to meet the need for trained probation personnel? Immediate, short range, and long range?

These are the kinds of pressing problems, illustrated so well by the material you have already sent in, that we must address together during the workshop. We hope that some helpful answers for the probation field will result from our deliberations.

THE TRAINING NEEDS OF PROBATION OFFICERS

DR. ELLIOT STUDT

Program Director
Staff-Inmate Community Project
Deuel Vocational Institution
California State Department of Corrections
Deuel, Calif.

Developing a training program for probation officers is a complex and difficult task. We want training to be effective. Any considerable investment in training should produce a demonstrable improvement in service to juvenile delinquents and their families. A training program should be efficient in its use of time and resources, since these are limited under the best of conditions. Yet the wealth of knowledge and skill that could be useful to probation officers, given the range of human problems we ask them to solve, is overwhelming. How do we choose the essential areas of content? How do we organize our training approaches so that the educational efforts directly affect the doing of the probation job?

When we are engaged in training people to "do," three kinds of questions are critical. First, we need to be clear about the nature of the job. What exactly are we asking probation officers to do? Secondly, we need to know what are the problems which probation officers themselves experience in trying to do the job. And finally we need to ask: What, among all the available training tools, are the most effective at different stages of educational need? When we can answer these three questions with clarity, then we can propose ***various kinds of training projects*** directed to ***various levels of content*** organized as ***agency inservice training,*** as ***institute or extension programs,*** or as ***graduate professional education.***

The probation task

In large measure, probation officers have thought of the probation task as comprising three, somewhat diverse, sets of activities or subtasks. A first and essential subtask has been formulated as ***control of the juvenile delinquent's behavior*** while he is on probation. We have sometimes called this surveillance. It involves seeing to it that the probationer does not commit further offenses and that he meets the normal obligations required of everyone in the community, such as going to school and fulfilling his work and family responsibilities.

A second, time-consuming subtask is ***administrative.*** The activities of this subtask include both those required to carry a case through the complicated judicial and bureaucratic procedures of a juvenile court, and those designed to mobilize community resources in behalf of the delinquent and his family. A final subtask has been defined as ***influencing the delinquent's future behavior.*** Through counseling, or other means, the probation officer is expected to help the delinquent modify his attitudes, his values, and his personality in such a way that he is capable of assuming normal responsibility for his own behavior at the end of the probation period. In our traditional formulation of the probation task we have seen the probation officer as the official person who is responsible for ***control, administration,*** and ***influence*** in the work with each delinquent on his caseload.

This way of formulating the probation job has produced problems for the probation officer and for training. It is almost impossible for a single human being to take, at one moment the stance of controller, at another that of administrator, and at a third the posture of a therapist, in relation to one and the same case. We all know how probation officers seek to solve this problem for themselves by emphasizing in their total performance one or another of these three functions. Thus, one officer may see himself primarily as a "cop"; another will operate in all his work as the efficient "bureaucrat"; and a third will skimp other activities in favor of the counseling role. And in our training programs we have often organized content around these three areas as though they were separate and distinct. The casework teacher usually talks only about individualizing the counseling relationship and rarely about how control measures can be individualized and used as part of treatment. Administrative procedures are taught as necessities of the organization rather than as means for relating human beings to organized society. Training about police and judicial procedures tend to emphasize the probation officer's support of these functions with little attention to team relationships in a process of social control which can be in and of itself helpful. Clearly we need a training program which helps the probation officer achieve an integrated perception of the probation task. We cannot ask him to be a ***controller*** plus an ***administrator*** plus a ***caseworker,*** because with this definition of his task the operations required by one role will often conflict with the operations required by another. We can teach him, however, to use controls and administrative processes within a helpful relationship in which each of these activities interrelates with the others and builds toward the ultimate goal.

A second complicating aspect of the probation task is due to the fact that the legal definition of juvenile delinquency brings a

wide range of personal and social problems to the probation officer's caseload. It would be easier if we could say that all juvenile delinquents commit offenses because they are emotionally disturbed; or because their families neglect them; or because they belong to gangs; or because they have school difficulties. Under such circumstances we could limit and focus the patterns of probation work. But experience makes it plain that delinquent behavior is multidetermined; that both personality and social factors enter into each case in various ways; and that an adequate service plan for one delinquent is different in important ways from the plan that would achieve social restoration for another delinquent. What is required of the probation officer is an ability to individualize each delinquent in his own family and social situation, and to use the appropriate skills necessary to get him reestablished as an acceptable member of his community. There is conceivably almost no limit to the variety of skills which the probation officer might be called upon to use as he seeks to individualize each delinquent on his caseload.

We have complicated the individualizing task of the probation officer because we have sometimes talked as though he is responsible for meeting all the evident personal and social needs in each case. Representing the court from its position of *parens patriae*, he has somehow been expected to take over many of the functions of normal parents for each of his probationers. At the same time, we have sometimes patterned this individualized relationship after the model of psychoanalytic therapy, expecting the probation officer to also produce basic personality changes to make up for all the mishandling of the child's early years. Again we are asking an impossible kind of functioning. And our training programs tend to reflect these conflicting expectations as we expose probation officers to psychiatrists who teach them to be better therapists and to lawyers to try to model their thinking along legal lines and to other experts each of whom thinks of the probation task as though it could be totally defined in terms of his own specialty. Sound probation work does call for knowledge and skills which are highly developed in other vocations including those of the police, lawyers, public administrators, social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists. But the particular constellation of knowledge and skills and the particular use to be made of them are determined by the probation officer's task. All training content should be selected with the probation role in mind, and methods of training should be designed with the goal of enhancing the officer's ability to do probation work.

Let us see if we can define the probation officer's task in a way which will help us select content and design training programs for probation officers.

The probation task is essentially a social process designed to achieve the safe restoration of juvenile offenders to normal unsupervised membership in the community. Each juvenile delinquent has been assigned a restricted supervised status, known as probation, because he has behaved in a way which evidences social danger to himself and to his community. The goal of probation is to use this probation period in such a way that at the end it is socially safe to restore him to legal freedom.

The task of restoring a delinquent to free, unsupervised belonging in his community seems to require two perspectives. In the first place, we need to see the delinquent as the nexus of a complex web of interactions all of which contribute to the fact that he behaves as a delinquent. To these interactions he brings his personality, which is in large measure the accumulated result of his life experiences with people. But he is also responding to the pressures which impinge on him from many kinds of significant persons and agencies with whom he is interacting. These persons include his family, his friendship group, the schoolteacher, the policeman on the corner, the storekeeper in the local creamery where the crowd hangs out, the welfare worker, the adults from criminal organizations who try to sell him drugs, or any others who may be, to him, significant for his delinquent behavior. He interacts with these persons in a framework determined not only by his tendencies to be delinquent but also by the culture of his neighborhood, the kinds of opportunities which are available to him, and the impersonal policies of the official agencies to which he is related. We can think of his delinquent behavior as the symptom that something has gone wrong in this complex of interrelationships. The social restoration of a delinquent requires modifying these interrelationships in such a way that they can support the erstwhile delinquent in socially acceptable functioning. This involves work not only with the delinquent but with the persons and agencies who are actually significant in his life space.

It is equally important to realize that this constellation of significant forces and persons is different for each delinquent. The task of the probation officer is to see the world through the eyes of the individual delinquent, to identify the crucial relationships in his world, and to work with both the delinquent and these others to correct the destructive interaction patterns which have led to delinquency in this particular problem situation. In the light of his analysis of each situation, the probation officer selects the appropriate pattern of work. Thus, in one case he may focus on modifying the delinquent's responses to an essentially benign situation; in another, work with the family or provision of a substitute family is of primary concern. In still another case, school and peer group relationships may need special

attention. There are many possible combinations as the probation officer uses his official position and his human understanding to help the delinquent, together with those who are significant to him, establish constructive interaction patterns. When this has been accomplished it is possible to restore the former delinquent to free belonging in his community. Until then the community needs the probation officer in the situation to provide special controls and relationship resources which the persons and agencies in the situation have not been able to mobilize for themselves.

If we accept this general statement of the probation task, we can outline the operations which are used by the probation officer:

1. He acts as an officer of the court to investigate and report on the delinquent and his social situation, contributing the results of his study in such a way that—

   The legal decisions necessary to protect the delinquent and his community can be individualized.

   The delinquent and his family learn to take part in an orderly social process for identifying problems and establishing means to deal with them.

2. He supervises the client's social activities in such a way that: Violations of the conditions of his status and his success in meeting conditions are perceived and can be reported.

   The general control plan provided in the status is individualized according to the client's need for constructive social control.

   The controls provided by the worker support the delinquent in acceptable social functioning and encourage inner growth toward self-control.

   The role of an acceptable member of the community is specified within the practical possibilities of the client's cultural situation.

3. He helps the involuntary client to—

   Handle constructively the stresses produced by the law enforcement and correctional process.

   Become motivated to belong as an acceptable member of the community.

   Ask for and use help in achieving belonging.

Learn how to meet his needs through socially acceptable behavior.

4. As the formal authority person in the client's life, he works with the other authorities associated with the client (parents, teachers, employers, social agencies, police), in such a way that—

   The problems of these authorities with the delinquent are alleviated.

   The adults in the delinquent's life form an aware and supportive team which assumes responsibility both for social control and for the provision of necessary resources.

   The delinquent is soundly linked with his groups and his community in a series of roles in which he is helped to perform acceptably.

5. He administers a caseload in such a way that—

   His own decisions are appropriate and responsible. The decisions of other personnel in his agency are respected, implemented, and appropriately influenced by his special knowledge of the individual delinquent.

   The necessities of legal and administrative deadlines are observed.

   The emergencies in the lives of delinquents are met with full attention to their significance for change.

   The delinquent and his family learn the processes of responsible performance.

6. He takes a responsible part in the development of probation as a creative social process and in the gradual change of his agency toward maximum service to delinquents and their families.[1]

In all of these operations, the probation officer can be seen as the individualizing link between the delinquent and his community. Because of behavior which is dangerous both to the delinquent and to those associated with him, the community has added a new factor—the juvenile court and its probation services—to the social control processes already available in the delinquent's situation. The task is to work with the delinquent and with the significant others in his

[1] This formulation of probation operations has been adapted from *Education for Social Workers in the Correctional Field.* SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM STUDY, Vol. V. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 50 pp. (p. 15–16).

situation so that at the end of the period of probation they are together ready to assume the responsibilities of normal social control. Thus, all of the probation officer's activities—whether concerned with the administration of agency procedures, the mobilization of community resources, the control of the delinquent's behavior, or the influence of attitudes and values—are integrated in the single task of individualized social restoration. And in our training programs the knowledge and skill required for each kind of activity should be presented from this integrated perspective.

The problems of probation officers

Effectiveness of training always depends as much on the motivation of the learner as on the cogency of presentation. It is particularly true in on-the-job projects that effective learning depends on starting with the problems which are actually experienced on the job. Only as training content is linked to the real concerns of the persons who have to do the job does the new knowledge become vital and usable.

It is not possible in this short presentation to list all the problems which probation officers experience on the job. It is possible to suggest out of considerable experience with inservice training programs some of the problems which are urgent for many probation officers.

Perhaps the outstanding problem for most probation officers is the variety of expectations which impinge on them from every side. More than once, probation officers who have been gathered for a "class in casework" have said to the writer: "Who am I? What am I supposed to do? The judge wants me to do one thing; the parents expect something else. The delinquent has his own ideas of how I am supposed to act. Schoolteachers, neighbors, and police each have their own expectations of what I am to accomplish. My work colleagues, with different educational backgrounds, each see a different role for probation. And the chief probation officer, who is responsible for administrative efficiency and for public relations, has his own specifications for my behavior. Now you, a casework teacher, come along with still another model. How can I do anything well until I am clear about my central function?" Perhaps one of the first tasks of an agency training program should be to help the probation officers develop together a workable image of the probation task. They are right that no one can do anything well in a role that does not have some inner consistency and central functional guide for choices.

At the heart of the role conflict which these probation officers describe is a contradiction between "control" and "help" which has

787

often been intensified by the experts from the helping professions. Professional personnel from agencies which rely on voluntary requests for help have too seldom understood what you do to help when the problem is one of social control. As a result they have further emphasized that the apparent dichotomy between authority and "good relationship" which is already built into our American culture; and the result of what they teach may be to intensify the authority problem which probation officers have been employed to solve. Probation officers together may be the ones who will help us get clear that a good experience with authority is potentially a tremendously therapeutic experience for youngsters who have not internalized the necessary controls over behavior; and that it is possible to support other authority figures in constructive influence on the delinquent. Training projects could well be focused on the question of how you use controls helpfully, how you individualize a program of social control, and how you use external controls to encourage the development of inner controls.

A closely related problem experienced by many probation officers concerns the communication difficulties which arise when a representative of middle-class values seeks to understand the world of delinquents who come from various racial and cultural minorities. How does the official world look to a youngster whose life has been spent in lower economic brackets and whose family has already been through a number of failure experiences with agencies which they don't understand? What are the stereotypes which the delinquent brings from street associations to his contacts with police and probation officers? What are the values to which he is loyal because of family, racial, and group experiences, and are these essentially antagonistic to the values which he should learn to accept under probation? How can you understand his view of the world so as to preserve what is useful to him and yet correct those aspects which are interfering with successful functioning? To what is each delinquent to be restored and how do you formulate obtainable restoration goals for individuals who will never be middle class in their values and outlook? Once again there are few experts who can answer these questions for probation officers. But there is much that probation officers can do together to enlarge the perspectives with which they deal with the deviants from the American middle-class culture.

Another large problem area for probation officers concerns the processes of bureaucracies. Probation officers are particularly in need of help in understanding the nature of organizations and the structural strains which affect their work because they labor in a hybrid organization, part court and part social agency. To a greater extent than most public employees they operate within a complicated

decision-making structure, in which the decisions of legal personnel, administrative personnel, and service personnel accumulate in case histories with significant results for human lives. The mass of detail which they are expected to master is overwhelming at first, and they need useful patterns for understanding and organizing these into significant processes. There are skills which can help the probation officer be a constructive member of such a bureaucratic team, and the perspectives of sociologists are very helpful in developing these skills. Somehow our training projects should enable the probation officer to see the difficulties of bureaucratic operation as something more than the inventions of heartless administrators. When he learns how to observe the structural sources of problems, he can join constructively with his fellows in suggestions for procedural modifications; and as a perceptive team member he can help his clients use the agency as a social organization with useful functions in their lives as well as with human imperfections.

The final problem for probation officers which we will note here concerns the task of establishing useful working relationships with clients who are fearful, suspicious, and angry. Probation is not the only service in which such feelings are expressed by clients. But each probation officer knows the drain of repeated new relationships which begin with wariness and hostility rather than with a request for help. How do you start helping a person whose only wish is to be free of your attention? How do you deal with provocative attacks without getting punitive? How do you identify and get into relationship with the basic needs which are hidden beneath the bravado and fear? How do you encourage the dependency which is necessary to get started with helping without fostering a crippling kind of dependency which is essentially a refusal to use help? Every probation officer, no matter what his educational background, can use the help of his fellows and of skilled leaders in considering the problems inherent in building helping relationships with delinquents from a position of authority.

Educational organization

Once we have clarified the nature of the probation task and identified the problems experienced by probation officers as they go about their daily jobs, it is possible to design many useful kinds of training projects. As we think of organizing such projects under different auspices and with different groupings of students, it is well to remember that content and method should be varied as we move from the inservice training level to the institute or extension course to the level of professional graduate education.

At the inservice training level it is probably most effective to

keep the content job focused. Motivation for participation is not tied to increase of knowledge for its own sake nor to the accumulation of credits for a professional degree. The learner in the inservice training program is inevitably concerned with the problems of his daily job, and his base of communication with his fellow learners is the agency job as they all know it. In this setting, the academic course model for learning is minimally effective; principles and basic conceptual knowledge are best communicated as they illuminate problems in which the participating workers are deeply engaged. Staff supervision, case conferences, and problem-focused discussions which can be illustrated throughout with examples from the daily job are the most effective training patterns for education of staff on the job.

The short course or institute or extension course is often made available to staff members from more than one agency. Such a project should be focused on problems common to staff members in the sponsoring agencies. But the approach will need to be sufficiently generalized to be useful across the board. Such projects require a composite teaching approach which links straight content teaching with the analysis of illustrative problems which are close to the daily work life of the participants. This kind of project is often more effective as the culmination of a preparatory period in which committees drawn from the participating agencies work over the subject matter, identify the issues, and collect illustrative material. By such means the project planners can avoid wasted periods during which the staff members from one or another agency dominate the discussion with matters irrelevant to the rest of the participants; the project leader gains a preliminary knowledge of the issues which are of common concern to all the participants; and all the participants come to the project with some readiness to consider issues in a perspective which is broader than the exigencies of the immediate job.

Generalized professional knowledge and skill are best taught within the academic structure. In such a setting the student commits himself to achieving a knowledge base which may not appear to be immediately useful on any job. He is motivated not only by a general professional goal but also by the fact that accumulating credits qualify him for better employment in the future. And in this setting there are academic disciplines that can be invoked to support such learning activities as reading and writing papers. The teacher in the academic setting is committed to imparting a general framework of knowledge along with the skills for the use of the knowledge; and the time allowed for each course permits both extensive and depth exploration of ideas. Each course is supported and enriched by related courses in the curriculum. It is usually not sound to use the academic

model for education—which depends for effectiveness on student commitment, extent of time, a credit structure, and a surrounding supportive curriculum—as the model for inservice training. Where the educational goal is the knowledge and skill base for general professional functioning, agencies would do well to use educational leave and stipend provisions to free their workers for the kind of disciplined, concentrated learning effort which is necessary to achieve professional functioning.

We can use a single important concept to illustrate the different training approaches which are effective at the different educational levels we have outlined. For instance it is common to find in prospectuses for staff training a subject called "understanding human behavior." By this we mean that we want probation officers to realize that delinquent behavior is not just an outcropping of "original sin" or the expression of an evil will. Delinquent behavior, like all other behavior, is meaningful; it is an attempt to meet a need or solve a problem within the alternatives that are actually available at the moment. Such behavior is also determined. Years of life experience have established patterns of behavior in each individual; and, when we meet him as a delinquent or as the parent of a delinquent, what he learned in his earliest years will have had much to do with how he can now perform. In addition, we want probation officers to understand that the groups an individual belongs to and the official organizations in which he participates also affect his current behavior, evoking from him one or another potential from among the range of behaviors of which he is capable. Thus what we want the probation officer to learn about human behavior from training is both a ***concept***—that behavior is meaningful, and determined—and an ***attitude***—one of scientific inquiry and understanding rather than of moral condemnation.

There is no limit to the material from the social sciences which could be organized for presentation to document this central concept, and the more a probation officer knows about how human behavior is determined, how personalities develop and what goes into producing pathological behavior, the more effective he should be. But the general intellectual stance which sees behavior as resulting from many factors and the attitude which seeks understanding rather than condemnation can be developed without formal courses in psychology, anthropology, and sociology. A series of conferences about difficult cases in which the leader encourages the participants to look behind behavior for possible meanings and to use these hypotheses in formulating case plans can teach untrained workers a method which is meaningful to them because it helps to reduce caseload headaches and in-

838

creases the chances of success. As this process goes on, generalizations can be noted and helpful reading suggested. Thus within the framework of an attitude and a pattern of work, a body of knowledge is gradually accumulated. In an institute, a wider base of content is educationally possible. For instance, one can select types of problem cases which are common in probation caseloads and present several illustrations of each, demonstrating how similar behavior may occur as the result of different constellations of personal and social factors. Thus the stage is set for selective teaching about the dynamics of behavior. In the academic course at either undergraduate or graduate level, on the other hand, a body of organized information can be presented as a conceptual framework which the student is expected to learn and apply to his analysis of cases.

No one of these educational means is sufficient in and of itself. The worker with undigested masses of theoretical formulation and no practice in relating these to human behavior as he experiences it on the job is sometimes worse off than the person who uses his normal good sense in establishing with his clients the best relationships of which he is capable. And the worker who learns a method of work without any help in understanding the larger perspective which makes sense of both his own and his probationer's behavior remains limited in his performance. But the selection of content, the level of generalization attempted, and the method of presentation should be chosen for efficiency of learning at each stage. In this choice the source of motivation in the learners, the surrounding pressures impinging on their time and energy, and the base for communication among them all need to be taken into account. There are many educational means which can support our probation officers in growth toward wise and skillful performance, and some are much more effective than others at each level of educational behavior.

The training task

We have seen that we are confronted with the difficult task of taking personnel who have not been specifically prepared for probation work and developing them toward a professional competent level of performance. On the job we can never duplicate full professional education. What we can do on the job is to provide means by which our officers' potentialities for good human relationships are supported, they are helped to learn constructive rather than destructive lessons from their daily experience, and they are gradually taught methods of problem solving that are useful for their clients. Meanwhile we need to invest both money and energy in developing supplementary educational projects which can fill in the necessary knowledge base.

And we need programs which increase the number of professionally educated workers in the ranks of probation officers. This task will not be accomplished overnight. But the key to improved service will be found in improved training; and our case as effective public agencies will stand or fall on the ability of our probation officers to serve people. We have no choice but to seek together for the most effective training patterns which can be achieved through a creative use of human and financial resources.

★ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1966 O—228-765

85 48